

ISSUES IN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

IIPA LIBRARY



9076

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
VALLABH VIDYANAGAR (Local Branch)

© The Indian Institute of Public Administration
Vallabh Vidyanagar

First Published : April, 1974

Price : Rs. 10-00

Printed at Gramoddhar Mudranalaya, Vallabh Vidyanagar

FOREWORD

All aspects of University administration were examined very carefully by each of the Education Commissions appointed in the past fifty years or so. A number of other Committees, some of them appointed by the Central Government and some by the State Governments, have also had occasion to study the subject and to give expression to their views. The University academic personnel has also not been inactive: they too have formulated their views, even though unfortunately their approach has, more often than not, tended to be somewhat narrow and to lay particular emphasis on the question of the terms and conditions of their service and their right to effective participation in University affairs. Their contribution could have been much more valuable, for, with their specially relevant experience, they were and are in a position to make a deeper study of the problems that face Universities in this country and to suggest how best the Universities can be enabled to play their proper role in respect of higher education. To avoid any misunderstanding, it should be added here that while as a body teachers have made but poor contribution to the task of identification of the problem of education and of formulating proposals for their solution, many of them have in their individual and personal capacity made quite valuable contributions. The significant fact to note, however, is that in spite of the fairly large volume of literature that exists on the subject, the record of implementation is poor. There can be no solution that will find universal acceptance. Why should we not now proceed to give effect to a good deal that is largely non-controversial? It will perhaps be easier to find answer to the controversial views once we start the process of change.

It is with some such object that the Vallabh Vidyanagar branch of the Indian Institute of Public Administration decided to invite a number of distinguished scholars who had given considerable thought to these problems to address its members on the broad subject of University administration. Here, in this small publication are brought together the views of these academic persons. Their addresses were followed by frank discussion. An effort has been made also to bring together in a summary form the views to which expression was given during those discussions.

The primary interest of Universities may be said to be two-fold: to see that young students acquire sufficient basic knowledge in the subjects of their choice so as to arouse in them a desire for a deeper study of those subjects, and secondly, to encourage and develop a liking for research work among the more promising of staff and students. This is why among the most important of the tasks of the Universities must be the maintenance and development of the highest possible standards in everything—in the quality of teaching, in the pursuit of learning, in the integrity and depth of research work, in the form, content and method of evaluation of work done and the creation of an academic atmosphere, and attitude among staff and students.

The University, for instance, is solely responsible for the formulation of syllabi of studies for different subjects and degrees. It is through the formulation of these syllabi that the University is able to give direction and guidance to the academic staff in respect of the level and standards they will be expected to achieve in teaching the undergraduate students. The University, likewise, has to accept responsibility for organising examinations which will satisfy the students and the world outside that they are conducted fairly and competently so that the results will be a reasonably accurate indication of the ability and application of those examined.

The University is also responsible for formulating policies in regard to the nature, quality and quantum of work that must be done in post-graduate departments. What the teachers as well as the University administration must sedulously guard against is the temptation to be complacent and to fall into a rut. If that happens, the University becomes a stagnant, a dead institution. It has to see that it is always ready to accept, after careful scrutiny, no doubt, new ideas, new thinking, new discoveries and new developments, and to go on modifying or elaborating existing syllabi, or scrapping them altogether and adopting totally new ones.

The Sardar Patel University, located at Vallabh Vidyanagar, has always been ready to try out a new idea, however radical it may appear at first sight. And this attitude has enabled it to innovate and to experiment. This constructive and creative approach, it should be noted, has been possible because the Sardar Patel University is a small University: There is a great deal to be said, indeed, in favour of a small University if only because it is possible to avoid academic jealousies and conflicts and to concentrate on academic work.

I would like finally to place on record with deep appreciation and gratitude the fact that we were able to undertake the task of organising this series of lectures and eventually to put this booklet in this form only because our parent body, the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, readily accepted our request for a grant.

Vallabh Vidyanagar

H. M. Patel

Chairman, IIPA
Local Branch

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Shri G. D. Parikh
Former Rector,
University of Bombay,
Bombay.

Prof. Jyotindra Mehta
Former Vice-Chancellor,
M. S. University of Baroda,
Baroda.

Prof. R. C. Patel
Prof. of Mathematics (Retd.)
M. S. University of Baroda,
Baroda.

Principal R. S. Trivedi
M. B. Patel College of Education,
Vallabh Vidyanagar.

Dr. C. S. Patel
Former Vice Chancellor,
M. S. University of Baroda,
Baroda.

Shri A. B. Shah
Director of Programmes,
International Association for Cultural Freedom,
Bombay, 7.

Prof. P. G. Mavalanker (M. P.)
Director,
Harold Laski Institute of Political Science,
Ahmedabad, 1.

Dr. M. T. Pathak
Reader in Economics and Hon. Secretary,
Indian Institute of Public Administration,
Vallabh Vidyanagar.

CONTENTS

Foreword H. M. PATEL	
Introduction R. S. TRIVEDI M. T. PATHAK	1
Academic Freedom, University Autonomy G. D. PARIKH	16
Personnel Management in the Universities : Academic and Non-Academic JYOTINDRA MEHTA	32
University Teachers and Administration R. C. PATEL	41
Students' Unrest R. S. TRIVEDI	49
Problems of Financing Higher Education C. S. PATEL	60
Indian Languages as Media of Higher Education A. B. SHAH	67
College Autonomy P. G. MAVALANKER	99

INTRODUCTION

R. S. Trivedi

M. T. Pathak

It is widely recognised that institutions of higher learning have an important role to play in any country, developed or poor, traditional or modern. The nature and significance of the role which the Universities can play will be largely determined by the prevailing socio-economic conditions in a given society, and the needs and aspirations of the people of that society. In a country such as India, where nearly two-fifth to one-half of the total population lives below the poverty line, where a vast majority of the population has not received the type of training and equipment which will modernise their attitudes and ways of working and where, because of its size, its varied cultures, languages and religions; the problem of national integration assumes vital importance, the universities have a vital role to play in achieving certain basic socially accepted objectives. The question of University administration in India should be considered in this wider perspective.

It is unfortunate that even while recognising the importance of our Universities, we have paid scant attention to the problems which, if they are not solved satisfactorily, will make it impossible for the universities to play their proper role. The Vallabh Vidyanagar branch of the Indian Institute of Public Administration decided that it could make some little contribution in this direction by organising a study in depth of the problem of its own admini-

stration which confronts every university today. Accordingly, it invited a number of persons who had had an opportunity of studying one or more aspects of university administration, to deliver lecture before members of the Institute, and to answer the questions from the audience and expound more adequately points made in this lecture. The areas of administration covered by these lectures were: (i) Academic Freedom and University Autonomy (ii) Medium of Instruction, (iii) University Organisation, and (iv) University Finances. An attempt has been made in this introduction briefly to highlight the various issues raised in the papers presented as well as in the subsequent discussion that took place among the participants, and to indicate some of the important issues that have escaped critical attention. The whole object of this exercise was to stimulate thought in connection with the University, which as an institution has a very significant role to play in the development of our country.

I. Academic Freedom and University Autonomy :

Two papers were contributed on the subject of academic freedom and autonomy. Prof. G. D. Parikh's article on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy is more comprehensive in its scope and has covered a much wider ground. On the other hand, the paper contributed by Prof. P. G. Mavlankar is more specific and has focussed attention very largely on the question of college autonomy.

The concept of university autonomy has been widely discussed and there appears to be a broad consensus on the connotation of this concept. The sovereignty granted by the constitution to the State legislatures to deal with university education is not questioned. Nor do the Universities claim immunity from the jurisdiction of the courts established by law in our country. University autonomy is regarded as necessary because without it, the universities would be unable to make worthwhile or mea-

ningful contribution. While elucidating the concept of university autonomy, Prof. Parikh suggests two possible qualifications which the universities will have to bear in mind. Firstly, university education is bound to prove relatively expensive in a poor country like India. Secondly, it will therefore have to be supported out of public funds, which in its turn carries the implication that the universities will have to accept the obligation of public accountability. As in a sphere, such as education, there cannot be yardsticks for evaluating costs and benefits, some other measurable norms will have to be discovered for assessing the success or failure of a university in discharging its legitimate functions. As Prof. Parikh puts it, "No institution supported out of public funds can escape such obligations and the university must be sensitive and reasonably responsible to any constructive criticism of its judgements and policies,"

It is generally recognised that university autonomy should be preserved in three important areas, namely, (1) the selection of students, (2) the selection and promotion of teachers, and (3) the determination of courses, methods of teaching and selection of areas of research. It is generally believed that university autonomy and academic freedom are likely to be preserved only if the academic wing is allowed to remain supreme in matters academic. At the same time, it may be worthwhile for the academicians to do some introspection and squarely face the question: "How academic are our academicians?" University autonomy and academic freedom will not be realised unless the academic community clearly recognises the importance and sanctity of these values and makes a determined effort to realise these values. There will have to be sincere and sustained efforts by the academic community in the pursuit of excellence in knowledge and in the development of an ethos which recognises the social obligations of the university. Prof. Parikh seems to be of

the view that in the ultimate analysis university autonomy and academic freedom will largely depend upon the quality of academic leadership available in our universities.

Prof. Mavlankar has contributed a forthright and highly refreshing paper on the subject of college autonomy. He has put forward two major propositions: (i) just as a university is keen to preserve and enjoy autonomy, it should also recognise (and not give) and respect the autonomy of colleges, and (ii) in an ideal situation, the nature and content of college autonomy will include freedom to determine the allocation of expenditure with given income, freedom to select staff and students and freedom to formulate curriculum and set the standards. Prof. Mavlankar hastens to add that such freedom can be made available only to those colleges which have attained a certain degree of efficiency. Most of our colleges have yet to attain this high standard.

Prof. Mavlankar has provided the necessary guidelines for improving the existing state of affairs. He has put forward several constructive suggestions for this purpose: firstly, the academicians should have a major say in matters academic, secondly, the status of the principal on the governing body of a college should be improved; thirdly, the teachers must make a supreme effort to keep pace with the latest advances in knowledge. The teachers should be given a reasonable degree of freedom in their teaching assignments; and finally, the students should have the right to learn the subjects of their choice, the right to express their views, and the right to be impartially evaluated at the examinations.

II. University Organisation:

There are three articles presented by three distinguished writers dealing with the university organisation and its sub-systems. Prof. Mehta in his article on "Personnel Management in the Universities" discusses the

present management structure right from the authority of the Vice Chancellor to the constitution of other university bodies and their members. His article focusses on the objectives of the university and stresses that if 'teaching' and 'research' are the twin objectives of the university organisation, then university is primarily an academic body. The non-academic element is merely incidental. Prof. Mehta has tried to analyse the structural roles of different authorities since university is an organisation of multiple authorities.

Prof. Mehta, a former Vice Chancellor, is critical of the present university administrative organisation wherein the non-academic element practically controls the entire administrative machinery. This ultimately creates a conflict between the academic and the non-academic personnels. As the administrative machinery has to serve the academic objectives of the university, the dichotomy of the academic and non-academic should disappear. This would be possible only if the university has a qualified and efficient personnel and if the university administration personnel is academically oriented.

Absence of qualified and efficient personnel is the root cause of mal-administration. A university should be staffed with personnel which is capable of thinking and has a perspective of developmental directions, with proper goal orientation. University administration in this context is not the retinue of Registrar, Deputy Registrar and his office cadre but its major component is the university executive, popularly known as the university syndicate. This body should consist of such qualified and efficient members that the body as a whole is capable of shaping a policy that is goal-directed and that has a plan perspective in the context of socio-economic changes taking place in the social environments.

The second article also deals with university administration but in the context of teachers' roles and parti-

cularly of the role of the university teachers organisation. Prof. Patel, though in favour of a powerful teachers' organisation, would like the teachers to play a creative role. He is critical, therefore, of the trade union like role of existing teachers organisations. Teachers must accept responsibility for creating an instrument that holds out promise for the realisation of values such as freedom and truth.

Prof. Patel's contention is that the entire university system works out on a contractual basis. The administration is differentiated from the academic community by the university acts. This concept reduces the entire university organisation to a role of an employer-employee, and explains why the university campus now-a-days is "a flame without any fire-brigade in the vicinity."

The dichotomy between the academic and non-academic pointed out by Prof. Mehta is emphasised by the property-oriented outlook of the university authority. Property is emphasised at the cost of freedom: freedom to plan for research, freedom to discuss policy are all brushed aside.

Prof. Patel, while analysing the present state of affairs focusses attention on the value-system that is based on freedom and truth. Teachers in their struggle must not lose sight of this important value-system.

Prof. Mehta and Prof. Patel have concentrated on the role of administrators, of academicians, and of teachers in the university administration. Prin. Trivedi in his contribution draws attention to the role of students in the structural organisation of a university. Behavioural manifestations in the form of defiance and challenge are every day occurrences on the university campus these days. Prin. Trivedi asks if anything is wrong with our youngsters, and appears to be of the view that it is not the

students that are at fault so much as the university administration, which has paid scant attention to the students, their problems and their difficulties.

University, according to Prin. Trivedi, has become a breeding centre of ignorance. It is because of this ignorance on the part of every human component of the university, including students, that the external agency in the form of politicians take advantage of the situation. The university administration is run by ordinance bound registrars and deputy registrars who are not in touch with students. Human relationship, creating an atmosphere of understanding, is the only way of guiding the young students towards creative purposes. The remedy lies in creating an environment of service in the university campus. The concept is new to Indian traditional society, but in the modern society, which is complex and yet open, students will have to be persuaded into moving in this direction in the educational centres.

It is not a pious platitude that the University should be looked upon as the most potent agency to foster the life of the mind. The University is the agency that can create culture, that can produce knowledge and high ideals. But Universities in our country do not appear to function in a manner acceptable of fostering the life of the mind, creating culture and fostering high ideals. If we look at the University senate and syndicate records and their methods of work, if we look at university committees, Board of Studies, Faculties, university examinations and examining bodies, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that entire university organisation is lifeless and functions as if it is not concerned with young lives, young minds, which are anxious to create and to grow. Our universities have largely failed in evolving any unified philosophy of life: indeed they have never even attempted the quest.

There is deplorable inadequacy in qualitative university output. The more one thinks of present universities in India the more one is reminded of Lord Curzon's bitter attack on Indian universities in those days of Imperialism. This is what he said in 1902:

"How different is India: Here the university has no corporate existence in the same sense of the term, it is not a collection of buildings, it is scarcely even a site. It is a body that controls courses of study and sets examination papers to the pupils of affiliated colleges..... look at the colleges! They are not a residential institutions, with a history, a tradition, a genius loci, a tutorial staff of their own. They are for the most part collection of lecture rooms, and class rooms and laboratories. They are bound to each other by no tie of common feeling, and to the university by no tie of filial reverence. On the contrary, each for the most part regards the other as rivals, and pursues its own path in self-centred, and sometimes, jealous isolation. The reproach has even been brought against them that their lecturers are not teachers, but are merely the purveyors of a certain article to a class of purchasers, that this article happens to be called education and that the purveyor stands not behind a counter but behind a desk." (Curzon's address to the Simla Conference, 1902).

One wonders whether with the passage of time, there has been any remarkable change in this situation! In 1904, Lord Curzon again comments:

"What ought the ideal university to be in India as elsewhere? As the name implied, it ought to be a place where all knowledge is taught by the best teachers to all who seek to acquire it, where the knowledge so taught is turned to good purposes and where its boundaries are receiving a constant extension. If I may borrow a metaphor from politics there is no scientific frontier to the

domain of knowledge. It is the one sphere where territorial expansion is the highest duty of an ignoble greed... the ideal university would consist of two aspects: it would be a place of dissemination of knowledge and the encouragement of learning; it would further be a human smithy where character was forged in the furnace of experience, and beaten out on the anvil of truth. ... A good deal depends on the state of moral and intellectual development of the race that is being educated there, and something also on the needs of the country concerned. But no good university, and certainly no ideal university can exist without playing both the parts.

Now, having drawn my sketch, if you ask me whether we have got this university here, or anywhere in India, the answer is unmistakably 'No'."

And if Lord Curzon were to deliver a Convocation address today in 1973, he would unfortunately have to admit that the country does not possess anything like the ideal university for India that he described in 1904.

IV. Medium of instruction

Dr. A. B. Shah has discussed very interesting aspects of media of instruction in higher education in his well studied article entitled "Indian Languages as Media of Higher Education."

Dr. Shah highlights the following aspects in his study:

- (i) Criteria for fixing up medium at the higher education stage,
- (ii) problem posed as a result of the change in the medium at the higher education stage,
- (iii) adequacy of Indian languages as media of modern higher education,
- (iv) correlation of language with its indigenous culture,

- (v) suggestions to promote development of Indian languages,
- (vi) role of English in the developing country,
- (vii) suggesting a point of view regarding the place of English.

Dr. Shah has mainly confined himself to higher education while discussing the medium of instruction. According to him higher education has a vital role to play in the reconstruction of the nation as a whole. The highly sophisticated concepts of culture, education and research form the basic content of higher education. This content therefore cannot be and should not be everybody's cup of tea. In other words, the rank and file of the population is not involved in this type of education. It is only the talented that will ultimately go through the process of higher education.

Dr. Shah has indirectly raised the question of the very objectives of higher education. After all, who is to be involved in higher education? What is expected of the product of higher education? If these questions are answered in specific terms, a good deal of service could be rendered to higher education. Higher education cannot be reduced to commercial terms of profit and loss. On it depends the progress and development of the nation. What type of student population is expected to help a nation's development? This is a question that is basically educational. Only the talented and gifted should find their seats in the institution of higher education. The question of medium of instruction therefore depends upon important variables, viz., the student and the content of higher education. The content of higher education should be more sophisticated knowledge of science, technology, social sciences and even humanities.

Therefore, the question arises whether Indian languages are adequate media of transmission, diffusion and

production of modern knowledge. Whether they can keep pace with the present accelerated rate of production of knowledge. A language of one culture will not be able to serve an advanced culture. If Indian languages are found inadequate to serve the highly sophisticated scientific culture, it is because the indigenous culture has not developed modern means of imparting certain quality of experience and certain mode of response.

Cultural transformation is a slow process and the development of a language cannot run far ahead of that culture. It is, in this respect, says Dr. Shah, that Indian languages are underdeveloped as compared with English.

Dr. Shah looks upon the frequently quoted illustration of Japan and Russia by Indian patriots as fallacious. The major premise in Japan's case is that the technological development started a century ago. When patriots cite Japan's development as an example they forget the the major premise. On the other hand, Dr. Shah urges the people, especially the policy makers, to take a lesson from Russia. The lesson is that underdeveloped languages cannot serve efficiently as vehicles for modern thought.

How can Indian universities hope to develop technology based on underdeveloped languages? It is Dr. Shah's strong conviction that Indian languages as they are today, are bound to fail as the media in realms of thought and sensibility which are not yet assimilated into Indian culture.

However, Dr. Shah has not lost hope of promoting rapid development of Indian languages. He is sorry that the endeavours put in so far are very poor. Translation of classical books is not a solution to promote development of Indian languages; for, translation is a poor technique of transmission. The remedy lies in a rational approach. To help Indian languages the first step required is to bring out graded Indian text-books in all disciplines by real scholars. Books cannot be accepted as 'standard'

written by popular 'market-writers'. Quantum is not the point but quality is the relevant approach in the production of text books written in Indian languages. Only real scholars of the subjects will have the power of expressing the subject-matter related to the culture of the readers. This goes a long way in providing motivation. Alienated expression of the subject-matter keeps the learner, the reader, at a distance which results ultimately in mugging up the material.

Writing of a good text-book is as important as any research work. Therefore, instead of taking up an ill-conceived programme of translation work, scholars from different universities should be invited and encouraged to undertake the sole responsibility of writing books in Indian languages which will be creative and original.

If the Indian intellectual elite class is expected to make a creative contribution, then education should be imparted in a language that is developed in the context of modern culture of the world. The feasible way under the circumstances in India, according to Dr. Shah, is to have two systems of higher education. One system may be called 'the first degree aspirations'. The other system would have English as the sole medium of education and would take up only talented students.

Dr. Shah is persuasive enough but understandably he does not attempt to answer numerous questions which arise in regard to this very difficult question of 'medium of instruction.' It would be easier to find a solution if the question could be considered unemotionally and rationally. That, however, cannot be. The tragedy is that knowledge of the mother tongue among students at secondary level is not as good and adequate as one would wish. Man is known by the language he speaks. Therefore, for a well educated and cultured personality, language has to be learnt and cultivated even if it is one's mother tongue.

General education thus requires a disciplined use of language. The cultured behaviour in the society expects a particular standard of the use of language. Examine the following statements and mark the difference between the proper use and the improper use:

—A speaker when asked questions from the audience says: "You do not understand my point."

The same speaker, if he says, "I am sorry I have not made myself clear. I will try to put the same idea again more clearly."

Language can be used as a lethal instrument, but that is something to be avoided and it is here that education helps.

Bertrand Russel, Einstein, John Dewey, Churchill, were not language teachers, but they knew the correct and cultured use of their language and hence they could reach the minds of people all over the world. It is, on the other hand, somewhat sad to see how inadequately the majority of our teachers express themselves in their own mother-tongue when expounding their own subject. Failure to do this is the failure in cultivating the mother-tongue to the higher level of expression. Therefore, despite the fact that we hold degrees and have won distinctions in university examinations, we fail to do justice to ourselves whenever skilful use of language is needed to give expression to our thoughts and to communicate them effectively to others.

In the name of English we try to conceal our poverty of expression even in our own language

In a democracy, skill in communication and ability to express oneself with lucidity and clarity are essential for success in life. They make it necessary for us to recognise the role of language and more especially of the mother tongue.

"Like money, language is no fit medium for exchange unless it has sufficient currency so that he who gives the coin values it in roughly the same terms as he who receives it." Language is a living thing.

IV. University Finances: Dr. C. S. Patel has raised some very pertinent issues regarding university finances. While he recognises that a final decision about the overall allocation of funds for university education can be taken only on the basis of a detailed study of university finances, he pleads for raising the share of universities in the total budget for education. He is probably right, but we shall have sufficient data for forming a firmer judgement on this issue only when the findings of the several research studies on university finances sponsored by the Indian Council of Social Science Research become available to us.

Since fees and donations are proving to be inelastic sources of revenue for our universities, the main source of finance has been and will continue to be the public funds. The government and/or the U. G. C. provide two types of grants to the universities, namely, the maintenance grant and the developmental grant. There are three major issues which we are facing with regard to these grants. First, the central universities, which obtain their grants-maintenance as well as developmental-from the U. G. C. have to face fewer problems and are in a relatively more comfortable position. However, the other universities which have to depend upon the State government for their maintenance grants and matching developmental grants, are in a most unsatisfactory position. So far we have not succeeded in evolving a rational mutually satisfactory basis for the transfer of resources from the state governments to the universities. Such an arrangement is highly desirable for enabling the universities to plan their programmes of maintenance and development on a satisfactory basis. The U. G. C. should take some initiative in this matter and persuade the state governments to rationalise the existing

system. The existing rules and procedures for releasing funds have been found to be rather cumbersome and time consuming. Efforts may have to be made, therefore, for streamlining the existing machinery for releasing the grants. While the governments are justified in requiring the universities to adhere to the highest standards of economy and efficiency, the universities in their turn would like to enjoy somewhat greater flexibility in the use of given resources so that they may have greater scope for initiative and experimentation. Finally, the concept of public accountability has to be interpreted in a more meaningful way for the purpose of auditing the accounts of the universities. The work and worth of a university should be judged more on the basis of what the U. G. C. Committee on the Governance of Universities calls "performance audit" rather than "expenditure audit."

Academic Freedom, University Autonomy

G. D. PARIKH

I propose to discuss the two concepts of Academic Freedom and of University Autonomy and their relation with each other in the course of this talk. The discussion will be in the Indian background, though not necessarily confined to it.

The two concepts seem to many to have the same import; to some others, they are overlapping, though not indetical. Yet others have tried to draw a distinction between them, a recent case of this kind being the Report of the Education Commission (1964-66). The Commission point out that "a distinction needs to be made between university autonomy and academic freedom of university and college teachers." Thus it appears that university autonomy signifies the right of the university as an institution or corporation while academic freedom refers to the rights or claims of individual members of the corporation. The former primarily focusses attention on the relation of the university with the government; the latter on its relation with its individual members and the relations of the members with each other. I shall therefore discuss briefly what the two concepts signify and how they are related to each other, indicating where necessary the actual situation in the country so as to make the discussion a little concrete and more meaningful.

It must however be made clear at the outset that neither of the two concepts involves an attempt even to qualify, much less to deny, the accountability, the justification or the responsibility of the universities. Higher education is expensive; universities as teaching and research institutions have to depend increasingly on the financial support of the government. Public funds will be available to them in a free or an earmarked manner. One cannot claim freedom from accountability for the use of these resources. It is true that many of the achievements of the universities lie in the realm of the intangibles and it will not always be possible for the university to explain and to justify its activities and allocations made for the purpose. But this cannot absolve the university from the need to explain, to argue, to carry on a steady and meaningful dialogue with the community. It may demand the right to allocate its resources between different purposes in a manner it considers proper; it will however have to relate such allocations to its overall objectives and policies and to justify them.

Again, broadly speaking, the principle of autonomy does not involve freedom for the university from social obligations. The claim to autonomy is in no sense a claim to a privilege; it is generally recognised that the university must have a sense of social responsibility and endeavour to fulfil its duties to the community at large. No institution supported out of public funds can escape such obligations and the university must be sensitive and reasonably responsive to any constructive criticism of its judgements and policies.

Autonomy thus does not represent any absolute claim of the university. In fact, in the context of a developing country like India, the responsibility of the university to contribute all it can to enable the community to achieve its goals of development and well-being will be all the more emphasised and the university cannot be expected

to get the necessary support of the community without such contribution. Given the conditions of poverty of a large majority, higher education appears to many persons to be a luxury, a privilege of the few. People cannot be expected to pay willingly for it unless they see the benefits derived from it.

It is essential therefore to recognise that if autonomy of the university is a matter of right at all, it is so in the sense of being an essential condition for the proper functioning of the university. As Sir Hector Hetherington has so ably argued, the claim simply is that the universities "are likely to fulfil their high service most adequately when the directives and judgements issuing from external authority are offered but not imposed so that universities have a large freedom in the choice of their objectives and of the means to be taken thereto." Fact, analogy and experience are the three grounds on which Sir Hector has upheld the principle of autonomy. It may be that autonomy of the university is not accepted everywhere, and that even in the societies in which it has been accepted, it is being increasingly questioned and doubted. But "it is nowhere totally denied or ignored." Secondly, as Sir Hector points out, "where the performance of function calls for the exercise of initiative and creativity, freedom from external constraint is a desirable, indeed a necessary condition." And thirdly, "whatever the formal relation of the university to its environing authority, the greatest achievements of scholarship and science have been wrought by men who worked by themselves or in free association with others, or in universities which are in no decisive way subject to external control."

The universal absence of the denial of autonomy implies a recognition that government cannot do the job of the university. On the other hand the university is a creature of the legislature; the statute of the legislature creating it can always be amended by the same legislature.

It is therefore clear that autonomy is universal but relative, not absolute. No social institution functioning within the framework of politically organised society can lay claim to absolute autonomy. It is always a matter of degrees and should not be understood merely in the sense of freedom enjoyed by a university under its charter. Such a formal view would be wholly inadequate. Autonomy is ensured by traditions and is related to the ethos of the university, its feeling of being a community. It involves both teaching and research, the two main functions of the university.

While the desirability of autonomy is not questioned or denied, it does not necessarily imply any particular form of university government. The control of universities is vested in different groups in different universities. We have instances, at one end, where this power is exercised by the teachers alone without lay participation of any kind. At the other end, are the cases of the State Universities. The latter are also found in democratic countries. Our universities, on the other hand, involve the vesting of financial and executive authority in a composite group consisting of the teachers and the community, while academic matters are usually left to the teachers alone.

All these cases are found to be compatible with autonomy. When therefore a question is asked as to who should control the universities, a definite answer is not possible. The question must be examined in the context of university situation in any given country with its specific historical and institutional setting. Our pattern also involves variations from State to State and efforts are now being made in some states to streamline the different university Acts. It is possible to differ both in respect of the feasibility and the wisdom of such efforts. There is a feeling in some quarters that they can only result in denying to the universities such marginal concessions as may have been made one time or the other.

Observance of a negative norm may perhaps be more helpful to autonomy. There should be no effort to use the universities as instruments of national policies. This is not to be construed as a defence of the Ivory Tower. But those who pay for the universities must exercise the necessary self-restraint and patience not to call the tune. This becomes all the more difficult in a developing country like ours where social needs take the form of planned targets and there is a keenness to realise them. The background is again dominated by the conditions of general poverty and a lack of appreciation of knowledge which does not result in immediate gains. Preserving autonomy in such a background, which is also a background of the absence of any deep rooted traditions of university life, can become a very difficult and delicate task. It can be accomplished only with imaginative wisdom and a concern for the more abiding interests of the community.

There is no reason, at any rate on the theoretical level, why the control of the university can not be entrusted to the teachers themselves. Those who are considered good enough to advise on how the economic, political or social affairs of the country should be managed can also be regarded as good enough to manage their own affairs. However, this is perhaps not so much a matter of theory as of the actual social conditions and traditions. In the absence of an overall helpful climate and a sense of professional and general integrity, any change in this direction can hardly amount to an improvement.

The concept of autonomy implies more concretely the freedom of the university in the selection and appointment of its teachers, researchers and administrators; in the selection and admission of its students; in the laying down of the courses of studies and the standards of attainment in order to qualify for the degrees and diplomas; in the freedom of research; and in the assessment of facilities

and the allocation of resources between different activities. Strictly speaking, the Indian university does not seem to enjoy freedom in respect of any of these matters. The issues involved in each of them are far more complicated than what appears on the surface; and it may be useful to comment on them briefly.

The statutes governing the standards of admission to the university cannot be laid down by the university alone; Governments as representatives of the community also claim a say in the matter. In a heterogeneous society like ours, they insist on seats being reserved for students belonging to the backward sections of the people; and the "open door" policy in admissions is also urged on the ground of extending the opportunity for education to increasing numbers. In a sense, this expansion is a part of a world-wide trend representing the growing aspirations of the people. The affiliating pattern has enabled us to absorb these growing numbers without being required to face seriously the challenges involved in the situation. Given the prestige of the degree, the opportunity to secure it is being extended at present even to those who missed it in the past; programmes of part-time education and correspondence courses obtain not only in the faculties of Technology and Engineering but in those of Arts and Commerce also. All this is happening not so much on the initiative of the universities but on that of the government and the politicians.

Selection of teachers may appear to be wholly a responsibility of the university; but it is not so in all cases. In one case, the power of making appointments has been vested in the Public Service Commission, of course without any appreciable improvement in the standards of selection. With the rapid expansion of education, it is difficult to get properly qualified and experienced teachers; the rules of recruitment have been relaxed frequently. The procedures generally provided for in this respect in

the different university Acts closely resemble the Public Service Commission approach; A committee with a majority of experts who have no direct knowledge of the university concerned and are complete outsiders are expected to recommend a teacher for appointment. The procedure does not necessarily lead to a better selection. If on the other hand, the faculty member associated with the Committee has his way, the result only is that he gets an individual of his choice without being responsible for the appointment.

The freedom enjoyed by the universities in laying down courses of studies and the levels of performance for qualifying for the degree is essentially limited. The Professional Bodies seek to exercise a detailed control in this respect and the universities have to respect their norms in case their products are to be eligible for entry in the professions. In the faculties of liberal Arts and the Sciences, there are built-in conditions which often resist any efforts at improvement. In the first instance, mobility of students has considerably increased thus lending a measure of plausibility to the demand for a uniform curriculum. While this is obviously ruled out, it does act as a compelling factor making the universities fall in line mostly with a common pattern in respect of the curricula. There is also the difficulty arising from the affiliating pattern. In the case of affiliating universities, any curriculum actually comes to have in operational terms the level that can be reached by almost the poorest of its colleges.

One of the major fields of the university is research. The university has as one of its functions extension of the boundaries of knowledge and must therefore promote research. It is in no sense however an exclusive field of the universities. The National Laboratories, Industrial Research Organisations, Individual industries, Institutes set up by the Union or the State governments for specific purposes are all engaged in research. There is a general

feeling that the quality of research carried on by our universities is not very high; In fact the trend has been towards carrying research of a high quality outside the universities and that there is a growing tendency to treat the field of 'pure' research, which may be regarded as a field of the universities, with a relative indifference. The resources available to the university for promoting research are meagre and the Professors have often to rely for funds on research contracts secured from outside agencies, a procedure hardly conducive to the realisation of the ends of a university.

A university cannot carry on all these activities with the help of the income from fees or from endowments; it has therefore to depend increasingly on the support from public funds. We have no 'private' universities as in the USA which can function as pace-setting institutions. Reliance on the State Exchequer makes them indifferent to the work of developing alternative sources of financial support; the private agencies, that can pay, start on the other hand arguing that the work of the universities is essentially a responsibility of the government. The universities thus find themselves in a position of almost complete dependence on state governments. Their grants when received as block grants are better conducive to autonomy than when they are made in an earmarked manner.

In the background of our university situation it is possible to argue that although we have a large and growing number of universities, most of them are of a recent origin and many have come into existence as a consequence of local or regional passions or with the purpose of satisfying the hunger for education or for prestige so rapidly growing in the community. Their traditions under the alien rule were those of assisting young men and women in earning their livelihood or pursuing social advancement. Though accalamatised, they have still to be rooted in the society around them. The social setting also generally does not

attach any great significance to intellect or intellectual attainments. It is a setting which tends to put a premium on administrative positions than on learning, research or good teaching. It is therefore quite possible that vesting control in the teachers might result in some of them spending their time and energy in dealing with administrative problems. Any such development is bound to lead to mixed feelings. The only consolation however is that the activities of a university do not permit any sharp distinction between administrative and academic matters. Most administrative decisions have an academic dimension; most academic decisions require to be administered. It is therefore not quite correct to conclude that the time spent in administrative work in a university has no academic significance, although given the paucity of good academic personnel, it may be a desirable practice to spare those capable of doing sound academic work from sharing any of the administrative responsibilities.

It is also essential that the view sometimes taken of the university administration is radically revised. It is administration neither of a government department nor of a business concern. It need not be influenced by the traditional approach of imposing a variety of restraints or safeguards before a given view secures acceptance, nor need it involve a mechanical insistence on procedures often born out of a distrust of individuals. At the same time, it cannot concentrate its attention on the results alone, for the simple reason that many of these lie in the realm of the intangibles. It may be described as essentially a method of achieving in a speedy but humane and flexible manner the educational objectives the university seeks to achieve. When administration is viewed in this manner, it will be possible to have a number of sober, responsible and seriousminded teachers participate in administrative matters without the feeling of waste of time. It might also help in solving the problem of entrusting to them

the responsibility for appointments, promotions and service conditions which all have a bearing on autonomy. No teacher need face difficulties in any of these matters if he is otherwise responsible and devoted to his duties.

The universities, as pointed out already, are bound to be claimants on the public exchequer in an ever increasing measure and the claims have to be met without any direct expectation in terms of calculable returns or without control over their activities. That can happen only when those who pay realise that building up strong centres of learning where truth will be pursued for its own sake, in a manner unmindful of the consequences, is an essential need, the very life breath of a free society. It is in the university that every one must be able to express himself freely and fearlessly and be ready to face the judgement of his peers, without the anxiety to earn his livelihood in doing so. Here all ideas and ideologies will be placed on the intellectual dissecting table and examined freely and thoroughly without fear or favour. It must have a place for both the satisfaction of "idle curiosity" as well as the "instinct for workmanship".

All this may very well be said on the level of the ideal; the Indian University is indeed far removed from it. There are some who maintain that it is seeking roots in the community. This search is essentially a search for recognition as an institution created by the community for meeting some of its essential needs. It must produce the personnel needed by the developmental efforts as also regain the liberal spirit. Can it do so? Will the university be, can it be at the same time both a collaborating and an autonomous institution? Can it produce a graduate who knows something as also who can do something? We must not only look for the answers but must have the freedom to experiment with them.

Freedom to experiment in this respect is essentially the freedom of the teachers and the students who constitute the university. The purposes autonomy is expected to fulfil will actually be fulfilled by them. It has, therefore, been maintained that the teachers and the students must enjoy the fullest freedom so that the ends of the institution may be achieved. We thus pass on from university autonomy to academic freedom. This latter may be briefly defined as the freedom to teach, the freedom to learn, and the freedom to pursue research and to publish the results thereof. These freedoms appear to be simple and non-controversial on the surface and may therefore be conceded on all sides. But they raise a number of delicate moral issues which it may be difficult to settle in actual practice. What is intended here is a brief comment on some of them with a view to provoking a serious discussion of the problem.

Can we maintain that the freedom to express himself must be enjoyed by the Professor in his own field of studies? His views thus expressed will be of obvious interest to his colleagues in the field, and sometimes to them alone, and will be scrutinised and judged by them. There is no guarantee that the Professor will always be right; there cannot be any, at any rate in some areas wherein the questions of right and wrong are not so easy to decide. It really becomes a question of tolerating error because reason is free to combat it. Why should then the same approach be not extended to fields on the borderline or those in which the Professor is interested, though they are not directly regarded as fields of his study? It may not be easy to draw the dividing line and we have therefore to concede freedom of expression in all areas to everybody.

And yet there are special considerations one must take into account in this respect. The professorial opinion enjoys a special prestige in the community as the opinion of one who knows. His position lends it a significance not

enjoyed by a member of the lay public. It transgresses the limitations of opinion and becomes in a sense a glimpse of knowledge itself. It has therefore to be formulated in the context of a commitment, a responsibility to truth and must therefore be objective. He may assert; but he cannot be dogmatic. Awareness of the limitations of his views and a respect for those who differ will therefore be the essential ingredients of his position.

Can we then insist on a certain framework the Professor must accept for his expressions? Issues sometimes arise in which his loyalty to truth may appear to involve a conflict with his loyalty to the community, the country, and so on. Is it possible, for example, to maintain that when the Professor goes beyond the normal field of his studies, his opinion enjoys any special prestige? Is it permissible to draw a distinction between opinion and knowledge? Must he be accorded a special treatment for his views or can he be treated as any other citizen? As a general rule it should be possible to maintain that the law of the land should prevail in this matter. The opinions of the Professor in this respect form a part of the common problem of civil liberties and should be treated the same way as the opinions of any other citizen. There can however be little justification for the imposition of loyalty tests or for discrimination on the grounds of opinions. It is true that when the Professor takes up a position or advances an argument in course of his normal teaching duties or research activities, he is under the obligation to pursue it no matter where it leads. If the position is wrong, one expects that it will get corrected in the pursuit. It is also true that a Professor will be expected to put forth his argument with moderation and propriety; if he is true to his salt, he will always be prepared for a rebuttal. But all this does not lend, I think, any special significance to his opinions in comparison with those of any other citizen.

Along with this must be considered the freedom of research. Should the problems of research be suggested by the Professor's own interests, curiosity and inclination? Or should they be indicated by others who enter into contracts or research? Is it proper for a university to accept research schemes on the basis of the results being made available solely to the Party concerned, whether it is a government organisation or a private industry? Or must it insist on publishing the results so that the benefit of the work, if any, may be derived by those interested in it? Should university personnel accept research contracts on the understanding that results will be kept secret? These and similar other problems arise indicating the limitations of academic freedom. No general norm can be suggested in this respect. It should be evident that the readiness of the university to collaborate, whether in defence or in development, will generally result in limitations on the freedom of the individual Professors and an understanding between them and the administration of the university in this respect is an essential condition for such collaboration.

The phenomenal expansion of education in our times has generally resulted in several difficulties of staffing or deficiencies in the facilities available; thus leading to discontent among the students. They are becoming increasingly critical of the management of the universities and are demanding a share in it. The problems arising out of this situation require an expeditious handling and must therefore be properly understood. There are, in the first instance, problems arising from genuine difficulties or grievances. It is essential to remove these at the earliest; and where remedial action is not practical, proper communication with the students must be established so as to make them understand and appreciate why action has not been taken. Secondly, there is the sphere of student activities, such as management of hostels, clubs, unions, games and sports, in fact the whole field

of extra-curricular activities, in which students naturally wish to have the freedom of management. It will be desirable to extend to them this freedom, the elders receding in an advisory position, offering advice if and when it is asked for. At the same time, certain spheres will remain in which student participation can hardly be useful. After all, one cannot wish away the fact that the student is still learning and has thus obvious limitations on his decision-making abilities. He may express himself in an organised manner on the nature of the curriculum; but such expression will always be for the consideration of the elders, who should be responsive in this respect. Thus, whether it is the curriculum, or the appointment of teachers or the system of examinations, the student can suggest but not dictate or lay down the law. He may ask for changes but he cannot demand them.

Expressions of student desires sometimes transcend the limits of the four walls of the educational institutions; sometimes they pertain to issues which have nothing to do with the system of education. They are frankly political. Sometimes educational issues may themselves be given a political expression. Whenever situations of this kind occur, the university finds itself in a difficult position. There is no general rule of handling them. But it is clear that the university cannot give up its responsibility altogether, although it may find itself weak in discharging it. The university stands in the position of *loca parentis* vis-a-vis its students. But in an age in which even the parental authority itself is being challenged, foster parents can hardly expect to be obeyed without question. But they cannot give up their responsibility. There would nevertheless be limits to what they can do, and the question will eventually have to be left over to the law of the land. The latter will also govern the question of the entry of the police into the campus, when a breach of law is likely to occur or actually occurs.

University autonomy with us is still a matter of an aspiration. It is hardly enjoyed by any university in reality. The relations with donors or sponsors hardly pose a problem for us; we are here mostly occupied with relations with government. Since all of our universities, with the exception of four, are creatures of the State legislatures and are supported by the state governments, they are often influenced by the local or parochial considerations or passions which dominate public life at the state level. Again, most of them are affiliating universities, with the result that while they seek freedom from government control, they do not extend any freedom to either the affiliated institutions or their teachers and students. Academic freedom is thus seldom raised as an issue. The problems in both the fields are not of limitations; they are rather the problems arising from the absence of the very basic urge for freedom. Activation of this urge is a matter essentially of leadership in our universities. This remains unfortunately in the hands mostly of those who are in no way distinguished by their understanding of educational problems. The failure of the Indian university will be the failure in a substantial measure of its leadership to adapt itself to the changing conditions. But the effort to transgress the limits of our situation and to grow to our proper stature must continue. It is difficult to find better formulation of the basic guiding principles in this respect than those summed from by Sir Walter Moberly's book: "The Crisis of the University."

The university is a place where there is agreement, even passionate agreement, on the conviction that intellectual pursuits are of utmost worth. The university is also committed to intellectual thoroughness. It has the fearless courage to follow the truth, however embarrassing the outcome to previous convictions and vested interests. The university takes pride in meticulous accuracy in matters of empirical evidence, embracing hypotheses if corroborates

and rejecting those it does not. In controversial matters the university plays the part of the judge rather than the advocate. It is impartial but not necessarily neutral. No matter how unpopular the results of its enquiry, the university insists on freedom of inquiry and publications. Indeed, it is so strongly openminded that paradoxically it does not have a very open mind about the value of the open mind. The university has a responsibility for focusing the community's intellectual conscience. It must be a forum where the issues of the day can be thrashed out and where nonsense can be exposed for what it is, no matter from what quarters it comes.

Personnel Management in the Universities: Academic and non-academic

JYOTINDRA MEHTA

I am glad that the local branch of the Indian Institute of Public Administration has taken up this subject of university administration with special regard to its academic and non-academic personnel. No topic is more opportune than this at this juncture when the Gujarat Government has just appointed a Committee to consider the revision of existing University Acts.

Universities are essentially communities of students and teachers. Ever since their first appearance in middle ages, I am talking about universities in the sense in which we understand them today, they have played a very important part in the life of the society in which they have been situated. For this reason in spite of many wars and catastrophes they have survived. In India we had in the past our ancient universities like those of Taxila and Nalanda; but we are talking today of the modern universities in India which came into existence during the British regime after 1857. The earlier universities like those of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras which were established after 1857 were more or less modelled after the London University, as it was in the fifties and sixties of the last century. They were affiliating universities, hardly did any teaching work and were largely examining bodies. Their main object was to create a class of educated Indians who

could be useful in the task of administering the country and filling the lower echelons of service personnel. In course of time more universities came into existence. Some of them directly undertook the task of giving instruction and particularly postgraduate instruction. The examining universities began to have teaching departments. In Banaras and Aligarh we had teaching and residential universities and federal and unitary universities also came into existence. After independence the number of universities rapidly went up and at present the number is nearly eighty, if we take into consideration institutions which are deemed as universities by the University Grants Commission.

Every organisation if it is to run in an orderly way and efficiently must have some kind of administrative machinery and personnel qualified and suitable to run that administrative machinery. We must be, therefore, clear about the aims and objects of the university so that we can define the kind of personnel needed for the proper functioning of the university.

Universities are essentially communities for the spread, propagation and imparting of education; but the process of education and acquisition of knowledge require research. The two twin objects of the universities are, therefore, teaching and research. Universities, however, do not function in vacuo. They exist at a particular place at a particular time and in certain environments. If they want to exist, they have to serve the needs of the society in which they are placed. This, however does not mean that they are service stations; but they cannot afford to be pure ivory towers of learning, completely detached from the cross currents of events at a particular time and the needs of the society. They have survived for so many centuries because of their usefulness to society and it is now realised that for survival of a nation in wars which

cannot yet be completely eliminated and for material, economic, scientific and technical progress, the necessary man power could only be provided by them. In the successful working of democracy every citizen should be able to take interest in the Government of the State of which they are members. It is universities and educational institutions which give them the training necessary for exercising their rights and duties as citizens with sense of responsibility.

Universities are, therefore, primarily academic bodies and the academic personnel and the academic bodies formulating the academic policies of the universities are their most important constituents. They are pre-eminently associations of teachers and students. They, therefore, should play the most important part in the university administration. The non-academic element is purely incidental. It should not under any circumstances be allowed to dominate the university administration. Unfortunately today in most of our universities the non-academic element is practically controlling the entire administrative machinery of the university and even its policy.

We will, therefore, first take up the academic personnel of the university. In the academic personnel the most important person is the Vice-Chancellor. He is the keystone or archstone of the edifice of university administration. He is the cementing link between the academic and the non-academic personnel. He has, therefore, to be an academic man or at least have an academic outlook. He has also got to be an administrator. The successful and efficient administration of the university, therefore, depends largely upon him. His selection is the most important thing. He should be such as to have administrative abilities and have academic leanings and academic experience. He must be a full-time worker and adequately paid. He should have the same status and emoluments as the

High Court Judge. Till quite recently in many of the universities the Vice-Chancellor was a part-time worker and an honorary worker. Usually the Vice-Chancellor was a High Court Judge. The University administration today has become so complex and most of the universities have now a large number of teaching and research departments and they do considerable extension work, it becomes absolutely necessary to have a full time Vice-Chancellor. The main object of the university is to impart instruction to advance and expand the realm of knowledge by research, and to preserve knowledge which we have already acquired. It would be, therefore, desirable to have an academic man at the helm of the university administration. He presides over the Senate, the Academic Council and the Syndicate or the Executive Body and therefore must have administrative abilities. How is the selection of the Vice-Chancellor to be done? As the universities are largely financed by the State, should the Vice-Chancellor be appointed by the State Government or should he be appointed by the Chancellor? The Chancellor is usually the head of the Government and therefore all acts done by the Chancellor may be influenced by the Government. In that event the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor may become political and politics may enter university administration and the autonomy of the university may be jeopardised. If he is elected by the Senate or the Syndicate, he is likely to be influenced by the electing authority, particularly if there is a provision for his re-election after a particular term of years. It would not also be proper that the highest and the most dignified appointment in the university be left to election and canvassing which is the inevitable part of all elections. Under the circumstances, the only alternative is to have an independent panel of distinguished and eminent persons not connected with the university to be selected partly by the University Grants Commission, by the

Academic Council of the University and a representative of the Government. This panel should select the Vice-Chancellor whose appointment may be formally sanctioned by the Government. The Vice-Chancellor should be able to give direction and coordinate the work of academic bodies and in general to formulate the academic policy of the university. He should also be able to give direction to the Executive Body in matters of administration and not allow himself to be dominated by his Syndicate or Executive Council.

Next in importance to the Vice-Chancellor are the faculties—by faculties I mean the teaching members of the university comprising of professors, readers and lecturers. As the main function of the universities is teaching and to create an intellectual climate in the country, the academic personnel that is the teachers is to be carefully chosen. There must be an independent Statutory Selection Committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and three or four experts in the subject in which the appointment of the teachers is to be made. The selection of the Committee should be respected except in exceptional circumstances where it could be proved that the selection was not made on considerations of merit but other extraneous circumstances. The Selection Committee may be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Committee from a panel of eight or ten men. As far as possible, the Selection Committee should not have more than five men. The heads of the departments in which the appointments are to be made should always be on the Selection Board.

The reputation of the university largely depends upon the teachers it is able to secure. It is their scholarship and their work which will give a stamp to universities. Great universities like Oxford or Cambridge or Harvard and Yale have earned their reputation largely because they have been able to secure great scholars of

outstanding abilities as teachers. In order to attract the best talents available for the universities certain conditions are necessary. The conditions of service that is emoluments, retirement pensions and other benefits should be such as to attract really outstanding men to go to the teaching profession. Somehow the teaching profession has so far failed to do so.

I had the opportunity of serving for some years on the Board of Interview for the personality test of candidates competing for the I. F. S. and I. A. S. Some of them had brilliant academic qualifications and were working as university lecturers, some of them were working in national laboratories and doing excellent research work but they preferred to go in for administrative services rather than remain in the teaching profession. Their preference for administrative service was based largely on higher emoluments, greater prestige attached to the administrative services and more opportunities for promotion. The teaching profession should be made as attractive, if not more, if the best talents in the country are to be drawn to it. There must be security of service and the conditions of service including the work-load should be decided by the association of university teachers in consultation with the universities. The university teachers should not be looked upon as employees of the university. They are the universities.

The autonomy of the teachers must also be respected. Whatever views they hold they should be able to place them before the public and the students without any fear, provided they are not purely for propaganda of any political party. The deans of the faculties and departmental heads should encourage initiative among the lecturers and they should be encouraged to come with proposals for better and more efficient working of their departments. All policy decisions should be taken by the departmental

faculty as a whole. The dean is a *primus inter pares* for coordinating the activity of the faculties and not the head of the faculty. It is desirable that deans should rotate; otherwise they get bogged 'up in petty administrative details and get out of touch with their subject and their main work of teaching and research. The deans and departmental heads are colleagues of other members of their teaching staff and not their heads.

In all academic matters concerning the university as a whole, the decision-making should rest with the Academic Council. It should be the supreme academic body and decisions taken by it in formulation of academic policies should as far as possible be final. It is wrong on the part of the Executive Council or the Syndicate to set aside decisions of Academic Councils in academic matters. The Academic Council should have representation of lecturers also and should not consist exclusively of professors, readers and principals.

As far as the non-academic personnel of the university is concerned, the most important body is the Syndicate or the Executive Council which has a fair representation of lay element on it. The executive body is mainly concerned with day-to-day administration of the university. The administration of the university, however, is so closely associated with the academic life of the university that it must have an equal representation of academic interests on it. It is not possible to completely detach the academic side from the administration. The Syndicate should consist of the Vice-Chancellor who would preside over its meetings, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, if any, two or three deans and two departmental heads and at least two representatives of the junior staff of the University. There should be at least five lay members to be elected by the Court or the Senate. The lay members, however, should have at least an academic outlook. They should work as

the link between the university and the community as a whole. The universities should not purely be bodies only concerned with teaching, research and spread of knowledge. They have to render some service to society, if they want to survive. The finances for the university are mainly found by the State that is the tax payer. If the community, therefore, has certain social objectives, if it wants to have a particular pattern of society, if it has certain plans for economic and social development or for technological progress, the universities should render whatever help they can. It is the lay element that can plan the social objectives before the university bodies. The lay element can also explain the point of view of the academic bodies to the society. Unfortunately there is a tendency on the part of the lay element to dominate the university administration and to use their position on the executive body for patronage, personal aggrandizement and to ignore the academic bodies and academic personnel.

The Senate or the Court again has a large lay element. It is largely the legislative wing of the university. It approves of the university budget, passes Statutes, reviews every year the administrative work of the university. It must have on its body prominent men in business, industry and profession. But even on the Senate there must be fair representation of academic personnel.

From the point of view of administration, the University Registrar should play an important part. He must be a good administrator, he must have a fair knowledge of law so as to interpret properly the university act and the statutes.

I have not dealt with the problem of academic and non-academic personnel of affiliated colleges. Many of our universities are still affiliating universities and they have to deal with problems of affiliated colleges. Most of these colleges are now spread all over the State. They are

not all situated in big towns but scattered all over in small towns. They are run by managing bodies who have collected the necessary finances to run the colleges. Many of them are not properly staffed, have not well equipped laboratories or libraries. Naturally the standard of education in these colleges would be sub-standard. The grades of the teachers there would have to be brought in line with those obtaining in the universities. The State and the University Grants Commission will have to have finances for equipping them with better laboratories and libraries. There should be exchange of teachers between the universities and the affiliated colleges.

The managing bodies will have to set up appointment committees consisting of experts and university representatives for selection of their teachers. On the managing bodies there should be a fair representation of the teaching element. The fact that the managing bodies started the colleges does not mean that they are the employers of the teachers and treat them as a factory manager or a business executive treats persons working under them.

No university can function properly unless it is realised that the teachers and the students are the universities. The teachers must have sufficient self respect. They should be able to express their views without fear and favour and conditions should be created whereby they should not feel that they are merely employees of the universities and the managing bodies of the colleges.

University Teachers and Administration

R. C. PATEL

That, by and large, Indian Universities live through drab and dull existence hardly needs any substantiation. The Kothari Commission Report bears enough testimony and provides a wealth of information in this connection.

However, it is not the prevailing conditions which cause so much anxiety to a sensitive observer as the felt absence within universities of potential nuclei holding out even some hope for the immediate future. It is this agonising absence of any hope that should constitute the hard core of our sensibility which alone has the power of any promise.

It is not easy to spell out any immediate measures; nor are the conditions perceptibly ripe for the adoption of any suggested remedies. And still every society, however chaotic it may appear at the moment, conceals within its womb such germinal centers of growth and progress, which, if identified, can be nurtured for a future hope. These tasks of identification and nurture call for a delicate sensitivity and an intense feeling for progress on our part.

It is here that one discovers the role of a university administration. The function of a university administration extends—must extend—beyond the enactment and enforcement of legal forms in terms of contracts whose absolute validity is now being challenged even in the spheres of

trade, industry and commerce. The history of ideas in general and university organisation in particular imparts enough validity to the proposition that the quantum of freedom afforded by contractual society is too thin to excite the creative potentialities of those who are governed by such legal contracts. Inadequacy of the quantum of freedom within Indian universities which is necessary for an elusive human task of innovating ideation offers an explanation and a crucial clue to the hopelessness of the existing situation.

Judged by this rod of the quantum of freedom validated by the history of ideas and that of progressive university organisation, our university administrations are a total failure. I can speak, at least, of the universities in the State of Gujarat without incurring the charge of being too wrong for I have, by now, a fair amount of information about them. Again, the truth is ascertainable. One has to read through the service contract an individual teacher has entered into with that abstract entity like 'The University' together with his conditions of work determined by statutes and ordinances. The administrations have cut down the quantum of freedom to a level which makes it difficult even for an observer sympathetic to them to ascertain its existence even with the aid of a high power microscope.

These contracts have been fashioned, it appears, with a view to subjecting a university teacher to the dominion of the administration differentiated sharply from the academic community by the University Acts. I suspect these Acts conceive a university as a mere manager of property. The object of a university administration—the Senate, the Syndicate and a governing body—appears to be the management of property which includes even university teachers. This obsession with property which needs an identifiable and 'efficient' owner has introduced within

the university trends which shape for interminable conflicts within the basic element of our university life. The campus is aflame without there being any fire-brigade in the vicinity.

The approach to property commonly adopted by the existing administration is similar to the one which one finds in modern farms and factories where profit motive reigns supreme. The teachers as 'employees' are governed by the laws of markets. There is hardly any ascertainable difference between a wage-earner in a factory selling his labor on the basis of a contract and a university teacher. These conditions generate among teachers a psychology of servitude and consequently of pain of being dominated. They preclude the rise of a feeling of romanticism without which a sense of responsibility and creativity can hardly emerge.

What is ignored by the Western countries in theory and by India in practice is the role property plays in social evolution. Property is a contingent historical emergence in social evolution; but on the authority of that all-respected philosopher Locke, we treat it, at least in practice, as a necessary factor in the rise of liberty. It is this fallacy of confusing contingency with necessity which provides for fateful social and political conflicts now poised for an eclipse of a civilised and human way of life. May it be noted that it is within the campuses that this fallacy is being challenged with violence and aggression, a tragedy which could have been avoided if our minds could have been a little more open. At the moment it threatens human values.

I do not wish to minimise the importance of property. For what is practised in communist countries in the name of eclipse of property is still worse. There its eclipse is accompanied by a total eclipse of liberty which alone can sanction a social action and can guarantee the human-

ness of social institutions. Property having emerged as a contingent factor in social evolution has still some progressive potentiality; only it is to be made subservient to the cause of human freedom and truth. Our university administrations will do well if they recognise this limiting condition.

In emphasizing property at the cost of freedom, university organisations in India have been dominated by administrative personnel whose perception of the value of freedom has been obscured by a callous self-righteousness. University autonomy, thus, has fallen into abuse and parochialism of the worst type is in the total command of the situation. It is no wonder, then, that our universities have not been able to attract the best intelligence in the country.

The problem before the country is to devise and adopt a unifying principle of constituting university administrations which would take up the task of modernising our universities in the midst of a poor and backward society. The problems created by the conditions of poverty and of backwardness which tend to pull down the forces of modernism are difficult to conceive and solve. Particularly the problem of incentive to a university teacher offers insurmountable difficulties. Monetary incentives are limited by the conditions of poverty and incentives in terms of freedom are limited by the conditions of backwardness. The vicious circle is obvious even to a layman. It is hazardous to believe that our political leadership and public opinion dominated by vested interests would generate the will and courage to break this vicious circle.

At the moment the initiative lies with the politically dominant section of the Indian community. In search of some constructive social work they pull the available local resources together and start the institutions of advanced learning usually with inadequate capital. They

soon find themselves in trouble because they do not have enough cloth for tailoring. The situation they usually face is one of conflict between the governing bodies and academic community. In this conflict, the dominant section of the society, more or less, stands in their support—thanks to the absence of appreciation on the part of this section of the urges of academic community for freedom and dignity. Being faced with a situation of conflict, the personnel of the governing bodies, through sheer intimidating insecurity, throw up a leadership which is aggressive, high-handed and blindly united. They are persuaded, in trying to resolve the conflicts, to isolate the nonconformists among the academic community, pounce upon them and vanquish them. This, in nutshell, is a process by which the Indian community's struggle for higher learning degenerates into a power struggle between the governing bodies dominated by politicians and the academic community struggling with only a dim awareness of freedom and dignity.

The situation, surely, is more intricate. It is a situation of conflict dispersed over a wide range of interests, both financial and spiritual, and impinging upon each other with expressed or unexpressed violence and aggressiveness and perhaps with less understanding on both the sides of the conflict.

A peaceful and creative campus is the result of a binding nexus to be provided by a value system which is more universal and whose pursuit is more satisfying than the existing pursuits of power and status on the part of the personnel of the authoritative bodies within universities and professional careers on the part of the teachers. The equilibrium, if any, between the contending forces is precarious and fraught with dangerous implications. Break-through is a supreme need of the existing uneasy situation. Such a break-through within universities is a prerequisite

site for similar break-throughs in wider situations within the totality of Indian society. The latter will resound with high amplitudes, once the former begins to assert itself.

The emergence of the principle of self-governing universities can provide the requisite break-through. Freedom and creativity are the two sides of the self-same coin. Before our universities play a creative role assigned to them by a meaningful social life, the value of freedom will have to take possession of the consciousness of common teacher and that of the personnel of university administration alike. This value alone can provide the binding nexus to a multiplicity of varied interests, even though they have a tendency to fall apart. This value has the requisite power of introducing self-restraint as against self-gratification within a fabric of vigorous creative pursuits.

Not that the consciousness of this value is totally absent among our university teachers. A keen observer can discover it buried and crushed under hostile environments determined by the social conditions of poverty and backwardness. Its vision is interrupted or distorted by the powerful interference of objective and fateful forces. Their action is concealed by the medium of the unconscious mind through which it is forged. If these observations and analysis are true, there is a scope for the activation of the consciousness of the values of freedom and truth. The hostility of the distorting elements can be softened by a rational therapy.

The principle of self-governing university (or college) requires that its governing bodies be predominantly manned by teachers. The process of decision-making within the campus should be entrusted to the academic community as a whole. The rest of the society should be given, within the governing bodies, a place from which

they can observe and criticise the process of self-governance. The desirability of self-governance within a university campus forms a relationship between the modern concepts of the values of truth and freedom. These values are basic to man's existence and progress and are derived from the very biology of man. Ideation is an act of freedom and enriches human life. The function of society is to promote and preserve these values and not to destroy them. A society which destroys them destroys the very dynamics of it. A university or a seat of higher learning is a social instrument for the realisation of the human value of Truth which, in turn, necessitates the adoption of the value of Freedom.

The need of the hour is the appreciation of these values and a movement for reorganisation of the life of the campus on the basis of such an appreciation. Teachers have a special responsibility—a responsibility of creating an instrument which holds out a promise for the realisation of these values. They cannot run away from truth in its modern secular version as against the ancient teleological one. On analysis one discovers that the pursuit of truth is thwarted even within our universities by forces which refuse to change their attitudes towards truth. They are still steeped in the concept of teleological truth for the fear of being alienated from the traditional society. The rise of secular rationalism as against the teleological one is the break-through the university teachers must strive for. Implicit in this idea of a break-through is a struggle to be waged more within their minds than outside them. As this struggle proceeds, the thwarting environments will break up to be replaced by new ones which will sanctify their strivings.

The associations of teachers provide the necessary instrument for the break-through. They must conceive and define conditions—both in terms of personality stru-

ctures and social relationships-for the rise of a new concept of a life in the campus. It is the rise of 'an intellect as a way of life'. Traditional concepts of associations as mere trade-unions have been losing their validity. Trade-unionism is merely a passing phase and will soon wear away. A new leadership of teachers will help associations transcend the limitations imposed on the activity of the associations by the existing trade-union demands. Not that these demands are unnecessary. They are quite necessary; but they should not be allowed to exhaust the being and becoming of the associations. The associations should take up the issue of self-governance and bring forth the conditions for its realisation through struggles of the teaching community. Those who strive and struggle for values are sure to identify their selves with these values. Struggle for these values is an inevitable phase in the process of the activation of the values. As such struggles develop, the atmosphere of despondence, of passivity, of cynicism and of want of self-confidence will begin to change and a truly romantic way of life will take possession of the mind of an individual teacher. A new brotherhood generated by the binding nexus provided by the consciousness of these values and together with it a new enterprise of ideas and ideals will emerge to provide to a larger society a directed political and social change which all appear to yearn for. This is not unattainable. Human history is teeming with events when men have attained goals which, hitherto, were considered unattainable. What is theoretically possible can also be practically so. The transition from a theoretical possibility to a practical reality needs architects ready to respond to a stirring call of human destiny.

Students' Unrest

R. S. TRIVEDI

"By the time a man realizes that may be his father was right, he usually has a son who thinks he's wrong"

— Readers' Digest
December, 1968

Students' unrest especially in India has been recognised through the behavioural manifestations of students right from their defiance of authority to violent outbursts of damaging the property or even physical assaults on their targets. This behaviour has become very common all over India in educational institutions of higher learning.

The turmoil is usually brought under control by the aid of the police force. Therefore the usual pattern of behaviour on the part of the students is violent outburst and as against this the usual mode of behaviour of the authorities is to curb it with police aid. The common factor between the students and the educational authorities is the language of police. It is said and educationally upheld that more communication channels be used in order to establish a rapport between the students and the educational authorities. But the authorities, it seems, prefer to select the line of least resistance, for, the channel of persuasion and other mode of communications demand greater patience and above all willingness to accept students as 'individuals' to be respected, and even a risk of accepting students' point of view which may be morally correct.

The students' unrest which is mostly an act of juvenile delinquency in India especially is never attacked on scientific lines. Never a study has been taken to see whether the disturbance raised is because of college youths or non-college youths. The agitation is normally raised by young colts accepted as student leaders. The first and the last step on the part of the students is also agitation. The authorities normally are not used to pay attention to things unless they are taken to the level of agitation. Somehow or other the inherent trait at both the levels is to see the point in the context of some sort of agitation. It is unfortunately the nature of the agitation that it cannot easily be calmed down. For, the methods to calm down are long nourished in the structure of the institution. It is still a far off day to find a single institution that is structurally so planned that it has evolved patient methods to meet with the points that require some treatment.

Students' unrest, therefore, in the existing structural situation is quite natural. This is not a matter of surprise. The absence of unrest on the other hand should create surprise.

On one University Campus after a very violent storm came a lull. The student leaders went underground. Accidentally one teacher during these days happened to meet these leaders in one of the tense moments of discussion. The apparent reason for the storm was a change in the syllabus and as compared with other neighbouring universities, it was said that, they were done injustice in the sense that their learning load was increased. The teacher in their company tried to argue out the case and inquired whether they know how the syllabus is formed, and who frames the syllabus etc. These students, it is said, were all in the final year and surprisingly enough they were ignorant about the fundamental proceedings of the university. They even did not know as to why the said change was made in their syllabus—but this was quite natural.

The instance makes one point very clear that stormy scenes take place out of 'sheer ignorance.' It is ignorance acting upon the ignorance and when once the 'storm' starts it is fear acting upon fear, the chief cause of all disturbances. In the name of justice, then, ignorance is punished severely physically by the external force; for, ignorance and internal force do not go and cannot go hand in hand.

What is wrong with our colts on Indian University Campus? The answer is nothing in particular but at the same time a place viz., the University, whose avowed objective is to establish understanding and create an atmosphere of moral sanctity, has become a breeding centre of all types of ignorance.

Very recently the students in one of the Universities went on strike. On being asked some of them said they observed strike because of the successful return of the space heroes on the earth. Some answered that because injustice was done to one cabinet minister. In other words the students were not clear as to why they were on strike, how long they should be on strike—in this context they enjoyed three holidays. The college and the teachers silently observed holiday-mood of their students. Prior to this mood one of the neighbouring universities was closed down for a week because of students' disturbances (disturbances are always students' because the elderly disturbance is out of the moral code of elderly ethics). The holiday-mood was accelerated and all were waiting for their mid-term break soon to commence within a couple of days. Therefore to link their holidays with the mid-term break, the students brought another news about the increase in fee rates, of course in schools, but the college students would love to be on the side of the school students.

These are instances that would indicate the action which is usually based on ignorance. The Indian young

'activists' are 'activists' in name. It is because of the ignorance on the part of the students and also on the part of the teachers and administrators that the external opportunist class is ready to take advantage and ultimately put the blame on either the students or the teachers or the university administrators. This ignorance carried further has resulted in hypocrisy regionalism and groupism in the midst of occasional lectures to students on National Integration. Everything has been reduced to routine—including the teachers and students with the result that students have become the permanent agitators and teachers have become the permanent purveyors of a certain article called education to a class of purchasers called students. The teachers are reduced to examination-revenue consumers. The university administration is similarly a routine matter dealing with papers, all lifeless; instead of dealing with young and bouyant boys and girls. Universities and colleges, consequently, have become impersonal organizations relying on lifeless administration. The University administration is run by ordinance-bound Registrars and Dy. Registrars who have never felt the students pulses.

The only channel of communication is the 'proper-channel' in the official language and the 'proper-channel' is still not known by many. The lack of communication is the chief source of all ignorance among the students and teachers.

Is there a remedy to this type of malaise? The remedy lies first of all in removing all darkness of ignorance by holding a torch of light. This torch of light is creating an atmosphere of understanding and right communication. Along with this, recognising the academic and only academic spirit of the University and roles to be played by teachers and students, outsiders, as non-academicians, unless required to assist in curriculum shaping or matters that require expert advice be not allowed

to dominate in the university functioning. The teachers all and sundry and students should be united on this vital issue.

It is incumbent then for teachers and administrators to understand the 'young adult' in his true spirit. The older people in the University instead of taking a view of 'generations gap' quite naturally, should recognise the following traits of 'young adult.'

1. The young adult is not still grown up adult but a growing adult.
2. He wants to be independent. He does not like controls and restrictions.
3. Progressive currents always affect him. He challenges, therefore, traditionalism in every walk of life.
4. He wants 'Intellectual Status' and therefore, wants to reason and argue.
5. He has wild imaginations.
6. He is completely under the 'affect' and 'conative' domain of knowledge.
7. He wants to lead by following the best.
8. He is full of idealism and is not corrupt.
9. He dreams of a life that is not with him.
10. He has vocational aspirations.
11. His intellect and reasoning, any way, want an outlet. He can never be a passive participant anywhere.
12. Being young he knows no barriers. He is completely latest in his outfit.

Do we really recognise these traits? Do we have patience to study them? What is the role of a teacher? The teacher in Higher Education has to assume a new role discarding his traditional role of a preacher only. The more one thinks in the direction of role-sense one is

naturally confronted with the basic questions about the roles of colleges and universities viz., (a) do colleges adequately recognise the young students? (b) do they recognise their social needs? (c) do they provide real environment of learning?

An attempt to answer these queries will reveal that the 'student'—his personality—is totally neglected and is being treated as mechanical robot. What better behaviour could be expected of this type of product?

To make the 'student' more humane and cultured let's think of developing their personality, providing study facilities and recreational facilities needed for their youthful growth, providing right type of games and sports, and above all, providing them the best lodging and boarding facilities. Let them not live like travellers in commercial lodges. The future of the country will be best nourished in college hostels. Further the 'student' could be meaningfully employed in the institutional management rather than mock-unions always dictated by the Principal of a college or the Head of the Department. The students' right to petition be always upheld.

To help building up a balanced personality of the student the most missing feature in Higher Education is the development of Human Relationship. All these aspects will further accelerate the intellectual health of not only the young adult but all the people connected with the process, programme and product of the Higher Education.

May I suggest that one of the solutions to establishing communication channels and thus creating an atmosphere of understanding is instituting and organising Student Services?

This aspect of administration at the University level needs, in the present context, a serious attention.

The idea of students' services is quite new to our society and more so to our administrative machinery. It is, therefore, very difficult to develop an idea that students coming from the community need to be served. At the most they may be looked after in regard to their studies. Still more liberal outlook on the part of the teacher will tempt him to keep a watch on an individual student's behaviour and thus keep his guardian informed. Thus a teacher normally plays a reporter's role and nothing beyond this. This attitude exists only at the individual level and not at the administrative or organisational level.

The idea that the university should look after the students in all its aspects is still new to the university administration. However, as a part of extra-curricular activities some of the activities like sports and games, physical education, Students Welfare Board etc., are the agencies set up for students to look after some aspects of their life as a part of extra-curricular activities. This also continued as one of the rituals rather than responsibilities of the administration. Therefore what is needed on the part of the university administration is to get a reorientation in the goals of higher education.

Education in general is concerned both with knowledge and individual. A balancing approach towards a rich knowledge and a rich individual is expected of the university organisation. A changing complexion of the present society demands a complex role to be played by the university product. Such a complex role further demands a mature behaviour from the finished product of the university. The university student as a finished product, therefore, needs assistance in looking at the world he lives in and the world he will be constructing. This assistance in other words is the core of providing the students services in the university administration.

Although non-academic in nature, student services

are considered a most effective adjunct to the structure of an educational institution whose main objective is education of the whole man.

This philosophical objective is further supplemented by the most realistic situation at present. The great struggle against cultural traditions has started. This is displayed in the students attitudes. Their challenging attitude towards existing social controls is a proof. The new drive of the lower social strata towards education has been creating problems at the higher education level. The first generation entering the university portals creates conflicting situation at the university forming a class struggle of culturally superior and culturally deprived class of students and even at home creates a split between educated young boys and girls and the uneducated, illiterate family.

Another typical feature of our society is that other social institutions are not yet ripe to take the responsibilities of assisting the growing young men and women in their problems and tensions. The only institution that should be competent, under the circumstances, is Education. Education has to play a multiple role and this multiple role makes the university multiversity.

The new role of the university, therefore, demands a reorientation and reshaping of the administration. Students need to be handled as living human beings and not as mechanical robots. Treatment of the students at the clerical level has proved inefficient. Circulars from the administrative office are proving hopeless tools to deal with. The punitive and negative measures of the university administration are outmoded. Educational administration and business administration are quite different. The new characteristics to be developed by the university administration are:

1. to understand the responsibility of becoming patient without disappointment;
2. to have open readiness to meet the challenge;
3. to create non-punitive atmosphere and readiness to accept feasible change;
4. to understand the conflicts and antagonisms between two generations as natural and thus handle it carefully instead of repressing the reality.

It is with goal orientation that the university can think of introducing students services in its programme. The traditional examination conducting structure cannot adopt innovations and thus cannot be institutionalised.

The students services mainly aim to help each student develop a sense of individual responsibility and self discipline. The concept of students services is based on the belief and conviction that every individual is unique, important and infinite in value and is capable of continuous growth. With this conceptual understanding of the students' services the objectives, if formulated, could be summed up as :

1. to help students understand the new intellectual and physical environment of the society and the nation at large;
2. to give the students a smoother type of transition from high school to college;
3. to enable young boys and girls to make use of superlative undergraduate training;
4. to help young minds in interpreting aims, objectives and programmes of university life.

To make these objectives functional the university must have an operational programme. Even to-day the programme exists through the following organizations viz :

Students Unions, Welfare Board, Physical Education Committee and such other formal organizations. But these organizations lack the basic concepts of students' services and therefore they operate in their purely formal and administrative set up.

The students services programme be organized at two levels—the curricular level and the student-personality-level. The curricular level could be developed keeping in view the following aspects:

1. Orientation of the students into the aims and objectives of the institution in particular and university in general. The entire curricular programme and its organisation and channels of communication be explained to the incoming students.
2. Diagnostic, Remedial and Developmental Programmes could be framed so that the slow-achievers as well as the bright students be given educational guidance.
3. Some of the students entering colleges through the diagnostic tests be asked to remain on probation in colleges. This may assist or eliminate the under-achievers or even unwilling learners.

The curricular programmes should assist students in assuming responsibility for their learning.

Another aspect of personality-level in the students services programme be focussed through a co-ordinated programme such as:

1. guidance and counselling
2. cultural programmes
3. housing and living conditions
4. financial aid and even placements in jobs
5. Health centre

The implementation of the programme needs a co-ordinator in the beginning and be further assisted by one or two staff members who are student-oriented. The

programme may be organized at the individual institutional level or even at the university level. It is advisable that the institutional-level be organised in the beginning and the co-ordination be provided by various committees of the university viz., The Students Welfare Board, The Committee for Sports and Games and even the Guidance and Counselling Bureau. The Guidance and Counselling Bureau may also assist the students in locating job-avenues. The bureau must work in its meaningful existence. Gradually these programmes be merged into one single agency that will be acting as the official agency for students services personnel.

A sort of research-cell to study the problems and tensions of the young boys and girls be set up and members of the staff belonging to Sociology, Psychology and Education may help in developing such a cell at the university level. Quite a few universities in India have set up the office of the Dean of students but unfortunately the DEAN exists without the real student-oriented programme,

The DEAN without the programme will further remain an administrative liability. Therefore let the programme be thought of and implemented at the institutional level in the first instance.

The entire students services programme be looked upon as part and parcel of the academic programmes instead of a mere addition of administrative work to be handled through files and correspondence with inward-outward number.

The right type of Students Services Programme will surely go a long way to smoothen the Students' Unrest and will also channelize the student potential into a constructive force.

"Hippies are lost sheep masquerading as shepherds."

Readers Digest—December, 1968.

Problems of Financing Higher Education

C. S. PATEL

Permit me to thank the Chairman and members of Indian Institute of Public Administration, Vidyanagar Branch, for organising the Symposium on 'University Administration' and asking me to participate in the programme by a talk on 'Problems of Financing Higher Education'. Before we examine the pattern of financing higher education and its problems, let us in a broad way recapitulate the objectives and functions of the Universities—citadels of higher education. In the rapidly changing world, Universities are undergoing profound and rapid changes in their scope, functions and organisation and are in a process of fast evolution. Their functions are no longer confined to the traditional functions of teaching and advancement of knowledge only but many new functions have been added. These are as broadly put down in Kothari Commission Report are as follows:

"In broad terms the functions of the Universities in modern world may be said to be:

- to seek and cultivate new knowledge and to engage vigorously and fearlessly in the pursuit of truth and to interpret old knowledge and beliefs in the light of new needs and discoveries;

- to provide the right kind of leadership in all walks of life, to indentify gifted youths and help them develop their potential to the full by cultivating physical fitness, developing the powers of the mind and cultivating right interests, attitudes and moral and intellectual values;

—to provide society with competent men and women trained in agriculture, arts, medicine, science and technology and various other professions who also will be cultivated individuals imbued with the sense of social purpose;

—to strive to promote equality and social justice and to reduce social and cultural differences through diffusion of education; and

—to foster in the teachers and the students and through them in society generally the attitudes and values needed for developing the 'good life' in individuals and society."

Universities are supposed to have been constituted to fulfil these objectives and functions and are vested by law to undertake administrative action in this regard. Adequate financial provision, therefore, becomes the first necessary responsibility of the State so that administrative arrangements follow unhampered. The main sources of income of Universities are grants from the Central and State Governments and the University Grants Commission, tuition, examination and other fees and other sources which include endowments, donations, sale proceeds of publications, etc. Broad division of responsibilities between State and Central/U. G. C. is that while all the three authorities continue to support the development programme, the State Governments are primarily responsible for the maintenance of State Universities and the Central Government for the Central Universities.

In this pattern of financing higher education, it is obvious that the Universities have only a very inelastic source of income from fees, as any substantial increase in the current rate of fees is not at all a practical proposition, so also other sources particularly donations and endowments which are meagre and fast drying up and these are again earmarked and have to be utilized for the purpose for which they are specified. Therefore, unless

a University has general endowments to support it-which most of the Universities do not have-it has to depend entirely on public funds-Government grants-for maintenance as well as development; study of problems of financing higher education, therefore, will boil down to the study of grant-in-aid system as applicable to higher education.

Let us first consider the maintenance grants. As far as Central Universities are concerned, these are processed by Government through University Grants Commission on cent percent basis and these Universities have not any serious difficulty. As regards State Universities, there are three main systems in vogue, namely, statutory grants, block grants and ad hoc grants. Statutory grants no longer prevail being rigid in nature and cannot function, as it does not take note of even the normal growth of the University leave alone the continuing rise in prices, establishment and emoluments prevailing in the country. Block grants and ad hoc grants are the only systems current in financing Universities for their maintenance.

Block-grants are determined usually on the basis of projected deficits of the Universities for a period varying from 3 to 5 years; if we take Baroda as a pattern, triennial block grant to the University is determined generally on the basis of: (a) receipt and expenditure of the last year of the previous triennium, (b) expenditure of development plan schemes which have completed the matching share and have become committed expenditure during the triennium, (c) eighty percent of expenditure on account of increase in the rate of dearness allowance during the triennium and hundred percent thereafter, and (d) three and a half percent of the wage bill towards the expenditure on annual increments etc. There are no well defined rules to determine the quantum of ad hoc grants. The University frames its annual budget on the basis of estimates of income and expenditure and submit to the

State Government. The State Government in its turn makes provision for a block-grant in its budget without any reference to the needs of the University as indicated in its budget estimates, perhaps deficits being the only criterion.

This is a very unsatisfactory manner of assisting Universities for higher education. Freedom from financial worries is one of the essential conditions for Universities to be able to discharge their academic functions in a satisfactory manner. Maintenance grants should be fixed on the basis of covering the entire liability of the University and should be fixed for 3 years after which it should be revised suitably; it should be fixed after considering the normal increase in expenditure from year to year during the fixed period of the grant and should provide for essential development expenditure. Apart from the quantum of block grant, another usual difficulty commonly faced by all institutions is the undue delay made by the State Government in releasing such grants. In many cases the fixation of grant becomes a matter of long delays and even after the fixation, release of annual grants is done at the end of the year and Universities find great difficulty to manage their financial affairs properly. There is a clear case for simplifying the procedure and streamline the machinery and procedures involved in grant awards. Universities should be assisted to create a contingency reserve fund which may be utilized for meeting the expenditure in anticipation of the release of the grant.

Development programmes are financed by the Centre-cum-University Grants Commission on the one hand and respective State Governments on matching share basis. This will vary. University Grants Commission provides cent percent grants for some schemes, e. g. for postgraduate and research development programmes and others 50% of the recurring expenditure and 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ % of the non-

recurring expenditure for other schemes; while the State Government provides the matching share consisting of the balance. This assistance is given for a period of five years i. e. the plan period. This arrangement involves a number of difficulties. There is a long procedure to be followed before State Government's approval is obtained, as this involves financial commitment and provision for not only the plan period but also a commitment for the expenditure by the State after the University Grants Commission assistance ceases. There is considerable delay in implementation of development programmes. However, if a University starts implementing the developmental programmes as fully approved after the University Grants Commission's scrutiny, it runs the risk of incurring financial liability which the Government may not agree to honour as happened to the Baroda University some time ago. The State Government in procedural delays approved the Third Five Year Plan programme only in the *last year* of the plan period and approved for grants only some items and not approving others even through the whole plan programme was before the State Government duly approved by the University Grants Commission. The University had implemented most of the programme. If the University had waited for Government approval for starting the implementation of the programme of the plan, all U. G. C. assistance would have lapsed and development programme stayed. [Here obviously early steps without delays on the part of the State Government for approval or disapproval of the programme could have been taken and implementation of the planned programme smoothened. Another problem that further arises in U. G. C. assistance is the provision on the basis of approved items of expenditure only and as such some essential and ancillary services are not taken into account, thus creating a further burden on their meagre maintenance grants. Further additional problem relates to the delay in release

of grants by all the three authorities Centre, U. G. C. and State. Since by and large Universities have no funds of their own to meet their developmental programmes, they have, therefore, to obtain overdrafts to finance such expenditure till the grants are received and in the process, they have to bear the burden of interest charges on such overdrafts. This situation could be met by paying at least 50% as soon as the scheme is approved and the rest being released on the receipt of progress report or a permanent development advance to meet temporarily the programme development expenditure like contingency reserve fund.

It is essential to review these different practices of grants-in-aid for the smooth development of higher education. It should satisfy some essential condition first. It is necessary to ensure that the grant giving authority does not exercise too much control and rigidity of approach as a system of checks and balances; the grant receiving bodies should exercise utmost vigilance and economy in utilizing public funds and the system should be sufficiently elastic and should leave some scope to the Universities to experiment with new ideas and projects. Thus a system of grants-in-aid should be so devised as to promote a free flow of funds from one authority to another and at the same time ensure economy, efficiency and allow for the necessary degree of flexibility.

In considering problems of financing higher education the basic major question is of financing of educational programme of the country and the total availability of funds for University system. This is too big a matter to be covered in this talk; requiring a survey of growth of educational expenditure and of the sources of educational finance. Roughly I would, however, like to suggest that out of a total educational budget for the State 25 to 30% allocation should be for the higher education, so that the very

minimum requirements and demands of development and research could be met. I am conscious that with very rapid expansion of Universities and student population and rising prices, availability of funds is not keeping pace with increasing demands both for the State and the Centre; but if higher education is to fulfil the objectives, no parsimony should be shown to the Universities and Colleges in the provision of proper financial assistance.

There is hardly any institution of higher education which is in a satisfactory financial situation; while economies have to be exercised, it is very necessary that more funds should be made available to such institutes for their proper maintenance, development and research. Grants should be disbursed properly in due course of time so as not to cause any worries or embarrassments to the management for delayed payments. A rational formulae should be worked out for grants in aid of higher education for colleges and Universities. Recently a formulae for block grants to Universities in Gujarat State has been worked out which is as follows:

1. Annual expenditure incurred by the University under the settled channels of expenditure,
 2. Increase in expenditure envisaged in view of developmental schemes and subsequent additional staff-teaching as well as administrative.
 3. Expenditure that becomes committed when the University Grants Commission plan help ceases.
 4. Expenditure on campus development and/or expansion of physical facilities not covered under U.G.C. scheme.
 5. Increase due to revision of pay scales or Dearness Allowance or other allowances or amenities or benefits.
 6. 6% increase to meet with the expenditure on normal annual increments of the staff on rolling basis.
-

Indian Languages As Media of Higher Education

A. B. Shah

What the medium of education at the university stage should be in India during the next decade or two would depend on a number of considerations. First, the language so used should be capable of being understood by the student without undue difficulty. Secondly, it should be capable of conveying to him the subtleties of modern thought and sensibilities; not all languages at any given point of time may have been sufficiently developed for this purpose. Thirdly, since university-educated persons will be called upon to provide leadership in various fields of public life, it is necessary that they go through a largely similar experience, and assimilate broadly the same values during their formative years. Fourthly, it should be possible for them to feel at home in the world community of educated men and women and, at least for some of them, to make their own contribution to the total pool of human knowledge. And lastly, of course, the final decision may be unduly swayed by the politician's rhetoric unless a solution is devised which, without sacrificing the best interests of the nation, takes account of the legitimate aspirations of the ordinary citizen.

From the purely pedagogical point of view it is no doubt true that, other things being equal, the best language

of education is the one with which the student has been familiar from his childhood. The mother tongue has this special advantage, but it need not be the only language in which the student can move with ease and comfort. It is a well-known fact that till the age of twelve or thereabouts the child can learn any language, even Chinese with its innumerable pictograms, without any special effort. The pre eminent role of the mother tongue as medium of education is therefore a matter of habit, conditioned by parents' choice and the ability of the school system to respect that choice. Even at the university level the better type of student has little difficulty in changing over from one language to another as medium of education, provided he has the right motivation and the aptitude for an intellectual pursuit. Anyone who, like the present writer, has taught for some length of time in a college would be able to bear this out. A change in the medium at the university stage poses a serious problem to a majority of students, primarily because they lack motivation and come, especially in smaller towns, from a background that is culturally and linguistically under-developed. This, I believe, is the only sound argument for introducing the mother tongue-as distinct from the regional language-as the medium of education at the university stage for those who want it. All other arguments such as the love of one's own language are inconsequential, however compelling they may appear to some.

As against this, it is equally true that none of the indigenous Indian languages enumerated in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution is sufficiently developed to function effectively as vehicle for modern thought. This is not merely a question of coining technical terms or translating a sufficient number of text books into Indian languages. What is involved in the process of learning at the university stage is familiarization with highly sophisticated concepts and their assimilation into the student's furniture

of the mind. And language has a vital and dynamic role to play in this process. It does not function merely as a conduit as most discussion on this issue seems to assume. On the contrary, every language actively reacts with the intellectual and aesthetic components of the culture it expresses. It is an inseparable part of that culture and an indispensable agent in its development, diffusion and assimilation. This is as much true of the exact sciences as of the humanities, and another language can take its place with reasonable efficiency only if the cultures represented by the two are broadly similar. As Cassirer observes, 'language shows itself again and again to be the mighty and indispensable vehicle of thought—a kind of flywheel that carries thought along with its own unceasing momentum' For 'though the word does not create the concept, it is by no means a mere appendage to it. It constitutes, rather, one of the most important instruments for its actualization'. Those who have tried to translate from English into any of the Indian languages, or are familiar with the problems of such translation, would know how frustrating the effort generally is. It is no doubt possible to turn out back translations as those commissioned by the Government of India and certain foreign embassies in this country amply demonstrate. One would, however, imagine that for higher education better standards of work would be required.

To see what is involved here consider the following extract from Erich Heller's 'Yeats and Nietzsche: Reflections on a Poet's Marginal Notes' in *Encounter* 195 (December 1969):

.....one of the last pieces of coherent, if mad, prose written by him (Nietzsche) is a postcard mailed at Turin railway station on the 4th of January 1889 and addressed to his friend Peter Gast. 'To my maestro Pietro,' it began, and then came the *Orphic injunction*: Sing a new song for me: the world is *transfigured* and *all the heavens*

rejoice'. It was signed '*The Crucified*'.....Brief and mad though it is, it is all but a resume of his early masterpiece *The Birth of Tragedy*, a work, which so intriguingly blends the learning and intuition of the classical philologist with the *dithyrambic confession of a soul singularly initiated*, as he believed, into the secret of beauty: that it emerges from pain and suffering, that *Apollo's command of surpassingly beautiful forms derives its power from the frenzy of Dionysus' dismemberment*. Thinking of Greek tragedy and Greek art, Nietzsche was inspired by Schopenhauer's *mataphysical pessimism and aesthetic exultancy* as well as by the Romantic trinity of love, death, and music upon which Wagner's *Tristan and Isolde* is founded.....How unimaginably must those Greeks have been wounded by life, Nietzsche exclaimed, *to redeem its horrors in such epiphany of the Beautiful*: Nietzsche, this *Christian of the aesthetic passion*, believed.....that it was the crucified spirit which in its agony acquired the power to *transfigure the world through beauty* so that *all the heavens rejoiced*. 'Sing a new song for me.....' It may be possible to convey, with some effort, the discursive essence of this passage through a free rendering in Marathi. However, it seems impossible to translate it into Marathi without sacrificing the rich overtones of its meaning—especially of the italicized words—which arise from the fact that the concepts of discursive thought are intimately charged with the moral and aesthetic sensibilities of the culture in which it grows. Take, for instance, the phrase, 'Christian of the aesthetic passion', in which a concept of the Greek tradition fertilizes one of the Christian, and produces something for which there is no counterpart in the Indian tradition. How is this to be translated into marathi? One may find a Marathi equivalent to 'aesthetic'; but how is one to express the idea behind 'Christ's passion' when the moral and theological tradition of India is basically different from that of the West?

Consider another passage, this time from social thought:

Scientific psychology, as well as contemporary *philosophy of mind*, reinforces the conclusion that whatever legal distinctions we make between 'advocacy' and 'incitement', in practice the distinction is functional. Traditional dualisms which isolate and insulate a man's ideas from the situational context in which they function, make ideas *vapors of a ghost* that inhabits but cannot activate the human machine. But analysis will show that once we distinguish between revery and belief, ideas are implicit plans of action...Words *trigger* actions when they function as signals in situations in which human emotions have been *keyed to the point of ready discharge*. They play the same if a slightly delayed function when they are *integral elements* in the patterns of *guided behaviour*. This is why and how ideas count in a material world.^a

There are fewer non-discursive (aesthetic, in Northrop's sense) overtones here than in the preceding extract and to that extent translation is easier. Even then it would be extremely difficult to express in translation the italicized words, since the concepts that underlie them are not yet part of the intellectual culture from which indigenous Indian languages draw sustenance. Consider, finally, the following passage from natural science:

Every energy *eigenvalue* of the free particle is *infinitely degenerate*. Since the spherical waves (IX. 30) form a *complete set*, the *denumerable* set of spherical waves corresponding to a given value of the wave number k , *spans the space* of the *eigenfunctions* of energy $E = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m; \dots$ ^a

No moral or social science, let alone aesthetic, concepts or sensibilities of a specific culture make translation difficult in this case. The concepts involved here are what Northrop calls 'concepts by intellection' and are thus completely free from the type of cultural conditioning which distinguishes the concepts in the preceding

extracts. However, they have arisen in response to the requirements of modern mathematics and theoretical physics, and presuppose a vigorous and sophisticated scientific culture for their birth and survival. To translate them into Marathi in the absence of such a culture would merely mean coining exotic monstrosities, which can only do violence to the spirit of the language by subjecting it to forced instead of natural growth.

It is claimed on the authority of modern linguistics that the distinction generally made between developed and undeveloped or underdeveloped languages is in fact meaningless. If by this is meant that linguistics provides no unique or objective definition of development in relation to language, one need not quarrel over the claim. However, this would not justify the assertion that no two languages can be compared from the standpoint of their adequacy as medium of expression for a given culture. Any language which is being used by a large group of people is, by definition, adequate as a medium of communication for *most, though not all*, purposes. But this only shifts the problem from a comparison of languages to a comparison of cultures in terms of complexity and sophistication. If a language which is adequate for one culture is required to serve another, more developed culture it is bound to prove deficient in certain respects. This is precisely what happens when an indigenous Indian language is used as medium of communication in realms of thought and sensibility which are not yet assimilated into Indian culture. In other words, the distinction between a developed and an underdeveloped culture provides, at the same time, a similar distinction between their languages, for they both express these cultures and are instruments in their further growth.

One may coin special terms for such concepts—‘संपूर्ण समुच्चय’ for ‘complete set’ or, as was proposed by Gujarat University some years ago, ‘अनिसार’ for ‘conver-

gence' (of infinite sequences and integrals in Mathematics). But efforts of this kind generally mean little more than a change of script and orthography.

A similar problem has to be faced in expressing modern sensibilities in Indian languages even when no translation is involved. The culture that these languages represent and are a part of has only recently been feeling the need for such expression. (Incidentally, that is why the work of new writers strikes the common reader as strange and artificial even when he is willing to make allowance for exhibitionism and the desire to shock.) 'Modern' here stands for a certain quality of experience and certain modes of responding to it. It does not necessarily mean western though, historically speaking, modernity was born in the West, and its seed can be traced back to ancient Greece. But in the context of our discussion what distinguishes the modern attitude is a conception of the lonely individual, whose sense of alienation gives rise to a feeling of *angst*, and drives him to make romantic, but in most cases futile, gestures of protest and self-affirmation.

All this is foreign to the Indian tradition and the mind it has shaped. It is only now, thanks to the paperback revolution and increased communication with non-British societies, that Indians have access to the literatures and arts of the whole of the modern world. In the quarter century that has elapsed since the end of World War II profound changes have set in in Indian life. But cultural transformation is a slow process, and the development of language cannot run far ahead of that of culture.

That is why it is not possible even today to express in Marathi the sensibility conveyed by *angst* or 'alienation,' as used by existentialist writers or philosophically inclined social scientists. 'Anguish' appears an adequate substitute for *Angst* in English because, in spite of national variations, English- and German-speaking people share the

same western tradition. It is true that the Indian tradition too talks of pain and suffering, but it also offers a theoretical explanation for it and an unfailing recipe of escape leading to supreme happiness. There is no uncertainty here, no conception of original sin or metaphysical pessimism, and therefore no cause for anxiety inherent in the human situation itself. This is a gulf that language alone cannot bridge.

It is in this sense that indigenous Indian languages are underdeveloped in relation to languages like English. However, this need not imply that they would never become suitable as adequate media for a modern culture. Only, one has to be patient in promoting their development. One must recognise that the path to development lies through a vigorous and sophisticated intellectual and cultural life rather than through mechanical efforts to stretch these languages on a Procrustean bed. This is possible only through constant interaction with the culture, of which the developed languages of [the West, and in particular English, are an expression.

We have therefore to consider whether it is possible to ensure without constant use of the English language, both for classroom instruction and for reading around a subject, that the time-lag between our own standards and the demands of a rapidly expanding body of knowledge is bridged in the foreseeable future. Human knowledge is expanding at a pace that is truly terrific. For instance, before the dawn of the modern age it took centuries to double itself and in the eighteenth century it was expected that soon this period would be reduced to half a century. In the years before the last World War, it was estimated at thirty years, while according to the late Professor Oppenheimer the doubling time of scientific knowledge would today be less than ten years.* Nor, according to Oppenheimer, does this tremendous increase in the rate of growth of knowledge 'signify by any means that qua-

lity has declined.' It may also be mentioned that Oppenheimer uses 'science' in the 'full broad, noble sense of the word', so that his estimate applies to social as well as to natural sciences.

Now no country whose universities do not keep in view the ever-expanding frontiers of knowledge can hope to develop a technology of its own either. For, like economic, technological growth also cannot be indefinitely sustained on borrowed capital. Hence, unless everyone who is capable of creative work in any field of knowledge devotes himself primarily to it, we may never be able to cover the gap between our own country and those that had an early start. Secondly, in this field only those can translate usefully who are able to create something of their own, so that hack work will, in some cases, be worse than useless. Thirdly, the amount of literature to be translated would be so large, and would at the same time be getting outdated so rapidly, that in practice not translation but isolation would be the result. Nor is it enough merely to provide that everyone would know English well enough to read the really important literature in that language if it is not available in translation. It just does not work, not in Indian universities at least, except at the level of the research scientist. In all other cases, as the issue records of libraries in universities that have already switched over to the regional language would show, what usually happens is that the student in most cases, the teacher also prefers to go without reading a book or a journal in English.

For another reason too it is necessary that a number of our best students and teachers feel at home in English for the purpose of expression as well as comprehension. In the absence of the ability to express oneself with clarity, even the power of comprehending modern knowledge, let alone of making a creative contribution to it, is likely to remain at a rather low level in all fields

save that of technology. In fact, we need also a fairly large number of scholars with a high degree of proficiency in other foreign languages besides English. However, as the growing importance given to it by countries ruled by varying ideologies would suggest, English has a special place in the field of knowledge and culture. The reason for this is obvious. According to a recent bibliography (published by Johns Hopkins University) of publications on economics brought out during the last few years, more than ninety per cent of the books and seventy-five per cent of the journals happen to be in English. Also, the recent growth of interest in the work of Japanese economists is primarily due to their switch-over from Japanese to English as a means of communication.⁵ Due to historical reasons, Indian scholars have an advantage over their Japanese or, for that matter, over their other counterparts whose mother tongue is not English. It would be unwise to throw away this advantage out of a misguided notion of patriotism.

The example of Japan is also interesting in another way. Those who advocate the banishment of English from the cultural and intellectual life of India invariably point to the remarkable progress made by Japan and the Soviet Union during recent decades. The inference is that this progress was made possible by their use of Japanese and Russian respectively. They also refer to the fact that in the non-Russian units of the USSR the regional language invariably is the medium of education up to the highest stage. The conclusion that is supposed to follow is that the degree of development of a language is a minor, if not an altogether irrelevant, aspect of the question, provided educationists are really interested in the spread of higher education and the diffusion of knowledge among the common people. The entire argument is so fallacious that even at the risk of appearing to digress one must dispose of it before proceeding further. This is

all the more necessary since it seems to have taken in even eminent educationists who ought to have known their facts before rushing to the press.⁶ Japan embarked on its programme of technological, not cultural, modernization almost exactly a hundred years ago, when the doubling time of knowledge was about fifty years—nearly six times what it is today—and when it was governed by a ruthlessly authoritarian regime. Secondly, it had only one language to think of. Its task was therefore incomparably easier than what faces a developing country like India today. Even then, till the democratization of Japanese society was well under way after the Second World War—that is, nearly seventy-five years after it had embarked on its technological revolution—Japanese universities were remarkably backward in the development of theoretical knowledge, especially in the humanities and social sciences. It is only during the post-war period that this deficiency is being made good with the thoroughness characteristic of the Japanese. The Japanese experience is therefore irrelevant to the Indian situation. We are tackling the problem nearly a century later than Japan; we have more than a dozen recognised state languages; and we have opted for a system of government that, rightly, rules out a policy of large-scale recourse to force or other modes of coercion.

The Russian experience also is equally inapplicable to India. First, Russian was a *developed* language unlike any of the indigenous Indian languages such as Bengali, Tamil or Marathi. A mere look at the cultural history of Russia—Chebyshev, Chekov, Dostoevsky, Hertz, Lobachevsky, Mendeleyev, Pavlov, Plekhanov, Pushkin, Tolstoy, Turgenev—would bring out the fact that Russia was in the mainstream of western intellectual life for a long time before the revolution of 1917. Also the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg, in the first decades of the

twentieth century, was the only one of the eighteenth-century European academies of sciences which still attempted to dominate the science of the nation. What the Bolshevik revolution did was to replace an inefficient tyranny by a ruthlessly efficient dictatorship with a significant change in the priorities of state policy in favour of science and technology. As to the non-Russian people of the USSR, about whose cultural and intellectual progress after the revolution so much is being said, one has only to take note of a few relevant facts in order to realize how misinformed these admirers of the Soviet language policy are. In view of the non-educational motivations of this policy, it is necessary to set it out in some detail.

The USSR, like India, is a multi-lingual state, but with one important difference. Unlike Hindi which is proposed as the sole federal language of India, Russian was a highly developed language of the Czarist empire when the Bolshevik revolution took place. Also, the Russians constituted more than 50 per cent of the total population of the USSR. As a result of historical evolution and state policy, they occupied, and still occupy, an overwhelmingly large proportion of key posts in every field of public life.⁷ They were sent in large numbers, not only in Czarist times but even after the revolution, to colonize other regions so that in the course of time, quite a few of the latter showed a population proportion that was actually in favour of the Russian language. For instance, the Karelo-Finnish Republic disappeared in 1956 because the percentage of the original population had become so small that, according to the nationalities policy of the Soviet Government, the Republic lost its *raison d'être*. It became the Autonomous Karelian Soviet Republic, which really meant integration into Russia proper.⁸ This was not an isolated example, for the Soviet nationalities policy subordinates the aspirations of ethnic groups to the interests of 'class struggle' and can even justify racial

discrimination on political grounds. Human nature and the facts of language and demography being what they are, it is to be expected that the interests of class struggle would, consciously or unconsciously, be identified with those of the Russian-speaking group. This has indeed been the case, thus perpetuating and strengthening the pre-Revolution myth of the Great Russian 'Elder Brother' in Soviet politics.

The myth of the 'Elder Brother' has been used as a pretext for steady russification of non-Russian Soviet life. Thus Russian is taught as a compulsory subject to Soviet children from the second year in school, and more and more children are attending Russian-medium schools. For instance, in 1962 the Russians formed 'only 54.5 per cent of the population of the Soviet Union, but 65 per cent of all school children attended Russian schools'.⁹ In certain regions the proportion of such children was much higher as the following table of percentages of pupils receiving education in their native tongue in four such regions shows:

Kabardine-Balkar A. S. S. E.	24% (in Kabardinian)
Adygei Autonomous Province	11% (in Adygei)
Karachai-Cherkess Autonomous Province	9% (in Circassian)
North Ossetian A. S. S. E.	19% (in Ossetian)
	(Kulturnoe Stroitelstvo, Moscow, 1958) ¹⁰

This policy has, quite understandably, resulted in a growing number—ten million according to the census of 1959—of Soviet citizens belonging to non-Russian nationalities declaring Russian as their mother tongue. It is also reflected in the preponderance of Russian publications and a correspondingly depressed state of other languages in the Soviet Union. For instance, 'as many as 82 per cent of all books, 78 per cent of all newspapers and 85 per cent

of all journals printed in 1960 in the USSR were in the Russian language.¹¹ There are no extension or correspondence courses in the Hebrew or the Yiddish language and literature, not even in the officially-designated Jewish Autonomous Province of Birobidshan, and the total number of Yiddish books printed in the USSR in recent years is fewer than ten.¹² Even the Ukraine, which is a member of the UN, had till a few years ago no Ukrainian dictionary of any type available. 'A concise Ukrainian-Russian dictionary was promised for the end of 1961. No mention has yet been made of an all-Ukrainian dictionary such as exist for all civilized languages (*a Little Dictionary of Ukrainian Synonyms* appeared in 1960, it has 209 pages in small 8vo, with 4,200 entries).....The Academy reprint of the sixteenth century Ukrainian dictionary by Berynda promised for 1960 has not yet appeared.'¹³ Evidence of this type can be adduced for any other non-Russian language of the USSR.

The purpose of the foregoing excursion into Sovietology is not so much to pass a value judgment on Soviet policy in the field of language as to provide a corrective to the mistaken view made popular in this country by the admirers of that policy.¹⁴ Nor do I believe that given the premises of the Soviet state, one can easily condemn *from the purely educational point of view* the predominant position of the Russian language in the USSR. It is the non-educational aspects of this policy and the attempts made to cover them up that would be open to serious criticism.

However, that is of no interest to us. What is relevant here is the lesson of the Russian experience for India, which is that underdeveloped languages cannot serve efficiently as vehicles for modern thought. Secondly, if an indigenous language is accorded the status of national language and as such receives official patronage, in the course of time it is bound to retard the development of

other languages. This is not a matter of choice. Language, like any other human institution, obeys its own laws of autonomous development, and these laws are more powerful than the pious declarations of politicians and educators.

This does not mean that there should be no attempt to promote the development of Indian languages so as to make them increasingly suitable as media of higher education. What it does rule out is any attempt to fix a time-limit such as was recently agreed upon between the Union Education Minister and the Vice-Chancellors' Conference. Secondly, translating text-books from a foreign language is not the best way of going about the business. Translations, however good, are not very relevant. Thoughtful teachers, even of science subjects, where the content is more objective and universal than in social sciences or the humanities, feel that foreign text-books at the undergraduate stage are only a mixed advantage. They are written by foreign scholars for foreign students and make a number of unconscious assumptions about the cultural environment in which they are to be used. In the original they at least have a certain internal unity of theme and treatment, which the student gradually comes to accept as natural because of the language of the book. In translation this unity is destroyed even if the meaning of the text is not distorted,¹⁵ and the teacher no less than the student feels that the whole thing is a sacred make-believe. And yet the Union Ministry of Education has entered into an agreement with Soviet experts to prepare text-books for Indian schools, that is, at a level at which local context is inseparable from the content of the books. That the experts would be committed to a philosophy which is diametrically opposed to that underlying education in India is an additional factor to note. However, even if they were British or American, the agreement should have been condemned as educationally unsound instead of being praised as an achievement of cultural

diplomacy, particularly when we are talking of self-reliance.

What is really necessary for the average university student before beginning a switch-over to his mother tongue as medium of higher education is a series of graded text-books specially written for him in his own language by Indian scholars¹⁶ who know their subject and share his cultural background. They alone can write suitable text-books in Indian languages which, by relating the exposition of their subject-matter to the background of the student, can provide the motivation at present sadly lacking in most of the text-books used in Indian colleges regardless of the language in which they are written. Not all teachers can do this work, and the few who can will need all the persuasion and facilities, especially those of leave and secretarial assistance, for doing it well. It is therefore necessary to look upon the writing of a good text-book as no less important than research of administration. This has for long been recognized in developed countries—witness, for example, Marshall and Laski in England, Dewey and Wilson in the U. S., Lebesgue and Goursat in France, Sommerfeld and Knopp in Germany, Landau and Kolmogoroff in the USSR, who have written outstanding text-books for undergraduate students. There is no reason why, properly approached, their counterparts in India should not write equally good books in Indian languages. Such a programme, besides being more useful educationally, will cost much less than the funds set apart by the Government of India for its massive but ill-conceived programme of translation by fiat.

Even if Indian scholars seriously begin to write text-books in their own languages, it will be many years before the process has advanced far enough to justify a total replacement of English by Indian languages at the honours and postgraduate levels. For what is relevant here is not merely the willingness of the scholar to

write but also the degree of maturity and subtlety to which his language has developed. It is wrong to imagine that the mere fact of using it as a medium of education will ensure the development of an Indian language as a suitable medium for modern thought within a reasonably short period of time. Such development presupposes the presence of certain cultural concomitants, which at present do not exist and which are not likely to come into being for quite some time yet. The intellectual climate of the country is still largely unfamiliar with the ideas which constitute the core of modern knowledge. Consequently, it would be Utopian to expect—in the absence of English as the medium of education in some universities at least—that Indian languages will automatically derive, from the milieu in which they will have to function, the sustenance necessary for rapid growth and enrichment. Nor will such a milieu have been created until modern science, technology, literature and the arts have the pride of place in our national life. This is a slow process, whose pace one can only marginally influence by consciously planned effort.

Another consideration to be kept in mind in deciding the issue pertains to the integrity of the intellectual elite of India in the crucial years ahead. In a multi-lingual country like India where the sense of a common nationality is little more than a hundred years old there is an ever-present threat of parochial loyalties steadily undermining the foundations of the national state. It is true that the exigencies of defence and the problems of economic growth, as also a number of all-India institutions including the universities and the national press, have so far kept regional rivalries within safe limits. However, in the final analysis there are only two agencies which can ensure the unity of a country and through which the forces of unity must operate and grow: the army and the intellectual elite. If the latter is fragmented through the regionalization of

the university system, only the army can prevent the balkanization of India. Whether even the army, with its officer corps recruited from a linguistically fragmented society, can hold it together would, from the recent experience of some African nations, appear not altogether beyond doubt. Apart, therefore, from the question of the viability of Indian languages, one has also to see to it that the decision on the medium of higher education does not weaken the integrity of the intellectual elite of India.

Before the advent of the British, Sanskrit and later, to a certain extent, Persian provided the means to foster the growth and continuity of such an elite. It is also interesting to note that when Buddhist and Jain scholars switched over to Pali and Ardhamagdhī they soon discovered that they had thereby cut themselves off from communication with the Sanskrit-educated, elite who, were the equivalent of the English-educated elite of today. Since no political passions were involved in that age, they wisely reverted to the use of Sanskrit in order that scholars did not remain divided among themselves. Something similar characterizes our present situation. For the first time in nearly two thousand years the British, through the English language, created a truly all-India intelligentsia in the nineteenth century. Its members shared the same modern liberal values and provided leadership in the fields of politics, culture, administration and the professions. Within a comparatively short time they created a nation out of a conglomeration of regional groups, which ultimately succeeded in offering united resistance to the continuation of foreign rule. Now that the British are gone, the political motivation for the maintenance of a unified intellectual elite is, unfortunately, a little less easily visualizable. But it is not therefore any the less necessary than before. No serious observer of the Indian scene during the last ten or twelve years will underrate the importance of a unified elite that is conscious of its obligations and adequately

equipped in respect of knowledge and attitudes to discharge them efficiently.

It is not possible to ensure the continuity and growth of such an elite unless its members are able to share one another's experience, aspirations and even frustrations through easy and frequent contacts during their formative years as well as in professional work. Which means that our institutions of higher learning should be all-India institutions not merely in name but in the composition of their staff and student bodies, and in the spirit of their functioning. This is not possible unless teachers and students, especially the better ones among them, are able to migrate from one university to another and to feel at home everywhere in the country regardless of the language of the region. With growing industrialization such mobility would in any case become increasingly important, for more and more persons would work in Central services, or business and industrial houses with all-India operations. Even at the State level, the exigencies of development will underscore the rather limited role of regional languages. In my opinion this means that all-India institutions and at least some of our universities and colleges in every State should have a common language as their medium of education. Indeed, as the Education Commission recommends, even a certain proportion of secondary schools may have a common all-India language of education on these and other grounds.

Whether this language shall be English or Hindi has to be decided on the basis of academic and political considerations. If Indian intellectuals are expected to make a creative contribution to the growth of human knowledge instead of merely acting as middlemen for the output of their *confreres* abroad, it is obvious that Hindi is as unsuitable for this role as any other regional language of India. What passes today as Hindi is barely a hundred years

old and is poorer than some other languages like Bengali, Marathi, Tamil or Malayalam. On academic considerations, therefore, the choice is automatically reduced to English. Besides being a highly developed world language, it is also an all-India language of longer standing, is wider spread and has a greater following than Hindi outside the land-locked, culturally underdeveloped Hindi-speaking States. I do not therefore see any role for Hindi in the field of higher education in the non-Hindi regions of India. From a remark made by him during a discussion with members of the Maharashtra State Board for Literature and Culture at Bombay on 6th October 1967, Dr. Triguna Sen also would seem to hold the same opinion.

If, as Dr. Sen said, the Government of India's decision had really been based on educational considerations alone, his Lok Sabha statement on 19 July 1967 would not have mentioned Hindi at all. Instead, he seemed to have been swayed by extra-academic, 'patriotic' considerations without, however, the courage to admit their presence. The generous but uncritical use of quotations from Gandhi and Tagore, including the former's comparison of the mother tongue with mother's milk and the advocacy of his own brand of Hindi as the link language of India in the place of English, betrays an approach that is in no way more educational than that of the politician. But figures of speech can sometimes be a dangerous substitute for rational argument. They appeal to passion rather than reason, and may boomerang on those who use them. For instance, if as Gandhi said, 'I must cling to my mother tongue as to my mother's breast in spite of its shortcomings for it alone can give me the life-giving milk', two questions have to be answered. First, even if the mother is healthy and well developed, how long should a child live on his mother's milk? Secondly, what happens if the mother is immature and underdeveloped and the needs of the child are far in excess of what she can meet?

In either case, a child that clings to his mother's breast longer than is necessary is more likely to starve and remain stunted than to get the 'life-giving milk' of which Gandhi and those who exploit his name so uncritically talk.

The foregoing argument has a bearing not only on the mother-tongue *versus* English but also on the Hindi *versus* English controversy. For most Hindus and quite a few Muslims (who are, understandably, anxious not to appear lacking in nationalist sentiment) it is axiomatic that in the course of time Hindi should replace English in *all* its roles as a link language within the country. Politically, this may or may not be expedient—I personally think it would not. However, educationally and culturally there is little doubt that such a development would be suicidal for the country.

What then should we do? At the outset, we should realize that it is futile to think of a *single* link language for the whole country and at all levels of public life in view of its uneven linguistic development and its varied needs. Even if, like Japan, India were a unilingual country it missed the bus a hundred years ago and would now have to adopt a different path from Japan's. Also, the fact that India is a multi-lingual country emphasizes the need for a reconciliation of conflicting claims and, therefore, for a non-simplistic solution. And, finally, since India is committed to the democratic system of government, any solution that is ultimately adopted must respect the student's right to receive education in the language of his choice. It would not be proper to condemn his choice as motivated by considerations of employment or worldly success. All that society may legitimately demand of him is that he should have the necessary ability and the willingness to work for justifying his choice.

Certain conclusions would seem to follow from the position outlined above. For instance, students who wish

to study through their mother tongue should be allowed to do so as soon as the necessary arrangements for it can be made. But, and this is equally important, those who wish to study through English should also receive the same consideration regardless of their mother tongue. It would be political coercion of a mean type to deny any legitimate facilities such as grants-in-aid, recognition etc., to institutions which cater to their needs. The unjustified advantage that English-or, for that matter, university education itself-is supposed to enjoy in matters of employment and promotion can easily be neutralized to a large extent by State governments' instituting their own tests for evaluating the job competency of a candidate regardless of the formal education he may have received. This would also improve the quality of administration besides reducing the pressure on universities, for most posts in government service the skills that are required are, in any case, not part of a university's job to impart. The comparatively few posts for which English would be required would also be the posts in which an officer should look upon himself as a member of an all-India service, in spirit if not in name, and must possess high moral and intellectual calibre. In the absence of the latter, mere knowledge of English would be of no advantage to him. And if his intellectual calibre is of the standard required for his work, the study of English would have presented no difficulty to him.

There would still remain the preference shown by private employers for candidates who have a sound command over English. However, unlike the government, they are not easily swayed by sentiment. They know what skills and abilities their employees should have, and are conscious of the price that must be paid for them. One may therefore assume that if they prefer men who have studied through English, they really need them in the interests of work and efficiency. Which would only

mean that beyond a certain limit English cannot be replaced without detriment to the country's economy.

The preceding argument would suggest that English will have to continue as the language of the higher levels of national life. These would include business and industry, inter-State and Centre-State communication and the working of all-India institutions in the fields of education, culture and research. With none of these is the average citizen, let alone the simple peasant, directly concerned. There is therefore no all-India role that Hindi can usefully play in higher education or even mass communication. The only exception would be that of the films, where however there is little that government or the universities can do. The Education Commission's recommendation that in the course of time Hindi should replace English as the all-India link language, and particularly in all-India institutions like the major universities', is obviously inspired by a concern for something other than the quality of education. The question here is not that of having a sufficiently long time limit for such a change-over but of frankly recognizing that English has to have a permanent place in the higher life of the nation. Nor should there be any heart-burning over this on the ground that English is not indigenous to this country. We see nothing wrong in the adoption of western science and technology, western concepts of jurisprudence, political and social justice, western institutions, even western modes of food, dress and marriage reception. To adopt a different standard in the matter of language for purposes that English alone can serve is to betray confusion, if not lack of honesty, in one's thinking.

There is another point which needs to be considered in this context. It is often argued that education through English has prevented the diffusion of knowledge among the common people and alienated the intellectual elite

from their countrymen. One has only to look to the social and cultural history of the preceding hundred years to realise how misconceived both these charges are. Also, the diffusion of knowledge presupposes a certain attitude to knowledge and to men of scholarship on the part of the common people as well as the ruling class. The growth of such an attitude is, among other things, a function of the spread of education and the expansion of the economy. Both these are a slow process, whose pace depends much more on sociological and economic factors than on the attitude of the intellectual elite.

Secondly, what precisely is meant when one talks of the alienation of the elite from the common people? If 'alienation' means a state of being in which the individual has ceased to share the values, beliefs and interests of his society, the Indian intellectual is hardly alienated from the ordinary people of the country. On the contrary, he needs to be alienated considerably more than he is today if he is to serve his people in any significant sense. However, if the word is used to connote a certain type of egocentric and antisocial attitude, the truth is quite the opposite. Anyone who reviews the developments of the last twenty years will easily discern a direct correlation between the growth of regional and linguistic chauvinism and slogan-mongering, on the one hand, and the steady deterioration in the standards of public life, on the other. The responsibility for this lies squarely on the shoulders of the politicians of the post-Independence breed. Their regression to the pre-English moral and cultural genotype has even corrupted the universities and the civil service, which together could have otherwise played a unique role in the modernization of Indian society. If this has happened in spite of a long chain of modernists from Rammohun Roy to Jawaharlal Nehru, it is in spite of—not because of—English education in India. English, as Vishnushastri Chiplunkar put it nearly a cen-

tury ago, is like the 'milk of the tigress'; the Hindu tradition has succeeded, almost effortlessly, in diluting it into that of the cow.

Apart from chauvinism, there are two other factors behind the opposition to English and the demand for its total replacement by an underdeveloped but autochthonous language like Hindi. They are the emotional need of the educated middle class to establish linguistic self-identity for the nation and an obsessive pre-occupation with a doctrinaire notion of equality. The latter has already worked havoc in the economic sphere, and is reflected in the demand for neighbourhood schools and the politician's contempt for the intellectual elite. However, such an attitude, besides undermining the prospects of development, is bound to harm the interests of talented children from underprivileged social groups, especially from the countryside. For no matter how the government decides the fate of English, the upper and urban middle classes will see to it, through private arrangements if necessary, that their children are properly educated in English. But who will nurse the talent of a potential Ambedkar? It was considerations of this nature that made the late Mr. Shankarrao More a founder of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and later a Congress member of Parliament from Maharashtra, condemn as anti-people the decision of Mr. B. G. Kher's ministry to reduce the period of teaching English at the school stage. And whatever else one may say of the Shiv Sena in Bombay, its leader has shown remarkable wisdom in demanding that Maharashtrians should not be denied the opportunity of studying through English.

It would thus appear that while a majority of university students may receive education through their mother tongue, a certain proportion would do so through English. These would include students of three types, the most important being the talented students out of

whose ranks would come the leaders of tomorrow in different fields of public life. There would also be the students whose mother tongue is different from the language of the region in which, for one reason or another, they happen to live. Their number will go on steadily increasing with growing industrialization and the expansion of the government sector in the economy. The mobility promoted by this process should be a welcome development in favour of modernization and national integration, provided we adopt the right type of employment and educational policies. Besides these two groups, there will also be some students who may wish to study through English even if their mother tongue is the same as the regional language. As argued earlier, they should have the freedom to do so provided they satisfy the norms that may be laid down for admission to an English-medium college or university class.

This would mean that, like all developed countries, India too would have two systems of higher education whether or not it prefers to recognize the fact without ideological inhibitions. One system would cater to the needs of students with what one may call 'first-degree' aspirations. It would have the regional language as the medium of education in most of its institutions. The comparatively few, working through English, would enrol students of the third type described above and those of the second type who are not eligible for admission to institutions meant for talented students. The other system would have English as the sole medium of education and would take up only talented students. This would ensure that the scarce human resources of the nation are not wasted through such students being required to take a mediocre academic programme with ordinary ones, as at present. Talented students coming from backward families with inadequately developed skills of communication may be given a special course in English for a period of six

months or a year before they embark on academic studies proper. Whenever necessary, they should receive generous scholarships from public funds so as to cover not merely their fees but all their expenses as well and, in certain cases, even a subsidy for their parents whose earnings would otherwise have been augmented by the student's working in the field or the factory. The number of such students will not be unmanageably large even for a developing country to support. If necessary the scholarships may be treated, partly or wholly, as loans to be repaid in easy instalments after the student begins to earn. The point is that, as the Soviet Union long ago recognized, human talent is too valuable a resource even from the purely utilitarian point of view to be allowed to go waste in the name of language, finance or ideology. If India is ever to move up from its present position in the rear of the procession of mankind, some such policy would appear to be inescapable.

This latter system should cover the whole country, by having at least one university with English as medium of education in each State, so that no regional group is denied the opportunity for the intellectual development of its youth. It should have the highest possible standards of enrolment and faculty recruitment, and should consist of institutions specially created for this purpose. This is where, incidentally, the proposal made here differs from the Education Commission's recommendation regarding 'major' universities.

In suggesting that some of the existing universities should be developed into 'major' universities, the Commission seems to have underestimated the extent of institutional conservatism, especially in the academic field, in India. Indian universities suffer from a hardening of the arteries due to age or congenital defects. It is futile to expect them to improve significantly in a reasonably short period of time. It would therefore be best to set

up new universities instead of wasting resources and time on the existing ones. Also, these new universities should be free from the pressures of the Union or State government and the political market-place. This can be ensured if they are looked after by the University Grants Commission, or enlightened private foundations like the Tata Trusts, rather than by the Ministry of Education at the Union or State levels. Experimentation would then have a better chance and, combined with a concentration of talent, it may at last provide a breakthrough in the field of higher education. Even if the government is not able to accept such a suggestion, there is no reason why Indian industrialists should not take it up. Over the years they have spent crores of rupees on politicians and political parties for purposes that had little to do with the interests of the country as a whole. Here, for once, is an occasion when they can honestly serve the country's interests and their own, and when neither of them can be served in isolation from the other.

It may be argued that a dual system of higher education like the one suggested here will lead to the emergence of a new 'caste,' that of the intellectual elite, in the country. I would concede the 'charge,' but with one qualification. The 'caste' would be a functional group, neither hereditary nor bound to any regional or linguistic community. Also, entry into it would be open to any aspirant provided only that he has the talent for it, and the government of his State or of the country gives him the necessary economic assistance in the form of a scholarship. Such a 'caste' need not cause anxiety to anyone except those whose survival in public life depends on the exploitation of parochial loyalties. It is only the students of the regional universities who may have a plausible ground for complaint. But their complaint would not be legitimate, for if they met the intelligence test nothing else would prevent them from exercising a free choice.

Equality, in education at least, should mean equality of opportunity, not of forced intellectual underdevelopment.

In considering any proposal for a really good university one has to take into account the financial outlay involved in it. My own calculations show that for a residential university of 2,000 students, excluding those of medicine and engineering, the total capital cost would come to about Rs. 20 million. This includes the construction of lecture rooms, administrative offices, students' hostels, staff quarters, an initial library with books worth about Rs. 500,000 and fully equipped laboratories for some of the science subjects. The cost of the land is not included in this estimate as State governments can easily make about 500 acres of land available without cost for a university of this type. As a matter of fact, two local communities in Maharashtra had offered to the Modern Education Foundation free land and some other, non-financial facilities for such a university.

If the idea of setting up about fifteen quality institutions of this type is accepted by the government, the total capital outlay will be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 300 million. The current assistance needed by them will be about Rs. 30 million per year. It will be agreed that this is nothing in comparison with the total provision for education made in the Fourth Five-Year Plan.

The solution suggested here takes account of the aspirations of the average citizen without sacrificing the immediate or long-term interests of the country. Such a reconciliation of apparently conflicting claims is necessary in India's educational policy because, unlike the UK and the USSR, we have chosen to adopt the American attitude to university education. The policy of selective admissions recommended by the Education Commission is selective only in name, and is likely to remain so for a number of years to come. For, after twenty years of unplanned and

unrestricted expansion of higher education, it is too late now to think of following a really selective admission policy. Nor, in the absence of adequate alternative routes to gainful employment and social status, is there anything wrong in the spread of higher education even of diluted quality among social groups to whom access to it was till recently denied. What is necessary is to ensure that the process of expansion does not swamp quality or make unduly difficult the task of raising it to international standards. Any policy that fails to meet both these needs of the Indian situation is foredoomed to founder either on the rock of populist sentiment or in the struggle for survival with honour in the modern, competitive world.

References

This paper was submitted to the seminar on Language and Society in India convened by the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla on 16-26th October 1967. It is included in *The Great Debate* (Bombay, 1968). It is considerably revised and enlarged for this volume.

1. Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, Vol. 3 (New Haven and London, 1957), p. 331.
2. Sidney Hook, *Paradoxes of Freedom* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1947), pp. 36-37.
3. Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1964), p. 357.
4. J. Robert Oppenheimer, 'Science and the Human Community', in *Issues in University Education*, ed. Charles Frankel (New York), p. 62.
5. P. R. Brahmanand, 'Utilitarian Language', in *The Times of India* (Bombay, 13 August 1967).
6. Cf. 'India can learn how to solve the language problem from the Soviet Union...The Russian example was a great one'.—Professor A. R. Wadia in an address to the Rotary Club, Bombay, reported in *The*

Times of India, 23 August 1967, after a four-week (sic) tour of the USSR as member of a cultural delegation sponsored by the University Grants Commission. Dr Sen said that education and a sense of 'National unity had solved the language problem in the Soviet Union. Although there were 63 languages in the USSR, there was a deep feeling of oneness among all.....Dr Sen said in this connexion that India could profit to a great extent in solving educational problems from a study of the Soviet educational system. Particularly, the Central Asian Republics of the USSR faced, about 50 years ago, the same problems as India was facing now.' *The Statesman*, Calcutta, 3 November 1967. Dr Sen, it may be mentioned, was giving a press interview after a two-week (sic) tour of the USSR.

It is not known whether Professor Wadia and Dr Sen know Russian, and were allowed by their hosts to see things for themselves without being constantly chaperoned by official guides and interpreters. However, there are at least a dozen studies in English from which they could have learnt more about the USSR than from a conducted tour.

7. Yaroslav Bilinsky, 'The Rulers and the Ruled,' in *Problems of Communism* (Washington, September-October 1967).
- Walter Kolarz, *Communism and Colonialism* (London 1964), p. 26.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
10. Robert Conquest, *The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities* (London, 1960) p. 123.
11. Walter Kolarz, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
12. Maurice Friedberg, 'On Reading Soviet,' *Judaica in Survey* 62 (January 1967), pp. 168, 175.
13. A. de Vincenz, 'Recent Ukrainian Writing,' in *Survey* 46 (January 1963), p. 149.

14. I would like to make an exception of the study team led by the late Dr Humayun Kabir to the USSR in 1956. Its report is more balanced than the gushing effusions of latter-day visitors.
15. The translation of J. K. Galbriath's *The Affluent Society* by a senior teacher of economics who is also a prominent creative writer and literary critic in his language is full of mistakes, which can only be attributed to the poverty of the language in question or to the carelessness of the translator. I am inclined to believe the first explanation.
16. For instance, Dr. D. S. Kothari on physics in Hindi, Professor D. R. Gadgil on economics in Marathi, Professor Umashankar Joshi on literary criticism in Gujarati, Professor Daya Krishna on philosophy in Hindi, Mr. J. P. Naik on education in Marathi and Dr. Triguna Sen on Engineering in Bengali. It is curious that few Indian scholars who advocate the adoption of Indian languages as media of education have cared to write any text-books in these languages. On the contrary, the late Professor R. Bhaskaran has written a text-book in Tamil on politics. The present writer too is co-author of a text-book in Marathi on the calculus, published about fifteen years ago and was, partly at least, responsible for the establishment of the Samaj Prabodhan Sanstha, an institution at Poona which has, during the eleven years of its existence, brought out more than forty books in Marathi on a variety of subjects, ranging from public opinion to relativity theory and cosmology.

The hypocrisy of the politicians, who condemn the use of English but send their children to English-medium schools, was exposed by a Staff Reporter of *The Times of India* nearly two years ago. I may add that creative writers who champion the cause of regional languages are no better in this respect.

College Autonomy

P. G. Mavalankar

I am grateful to the organizers of this symposium for giving me an opportunity to come here and share my views on the subject of college autonomy with you all. I have had a fairly close acquaintance with academic life and institutions for the last two decades and more, and this has enabled me to form certain views on this important subject.

At the outset, I may say that we should make a clear distinction between college autonomy and autonomous colleges. The concept of autonomous colleges is very good, and obviously, a reasonable degree of autonomy is inherent in this idea of autonomous colleges. However, important though it is, I do not propose to discuss today the question of autonomous colleges.

Though the terms college autonomy and freedom are fairly fashionable these days, we usually talk about them without trying to put them in practice. One is not ready to go in that direction even partially because it does involve certain responsibilities as well as sacrifices. As the experience of the Western countries shows, the idea of college autonomy can be developed over a number of years. The reasons for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in this respect in our country may well be that we either lack courage or we do not have sufficiently strong conviction on the subject. Prof. Eric Ashby, an authority on University administration, says that though the terms

academic freedom and autonomy are used frequently, they are more often confused. As these terms are highly emotive, every one will have his own idea about them. It should be emphasised that the concepts of academic freedom and college autonomy need not necessarily go together. A college may be autonomous without having a reasonable degree of academic freedom. Academic freedom in its true sense exists only when, apart from the college managements and teachers, the students also enjoy this freedom. The value of academic freedom is indeed very great because only a free man can be an upright and honest citizen of a democratic polity.

Professor Ashby has outlined six conditions for college autonomy:

1. Freedom to select students,
2. Freedom to select staff and set their conditions of work,
3. Freedom to get its own standards,
4. Freedom to design curriculum,
5. Given the necessary income, freedom to decide the various allocations of expenditure, and
6. Identification of the non-academic staff with the University / college.

Now, it is important that all the academic decisions are delegated to the academicians themselves. They should be treated as members of the society and not as employees of some management. The above six conditions will have to be substantially fulfilled if the college autonomy is to be achieved and preserved. However, it is necessary to emphasise that such freedom can be given to the college only when certain minimum standards of efficiency and work have been achieved by them. In fact, this is not so for most of the colleges either in Gujarat or in

opening of a college has become a matter of prestige and has even become a political issue. When I plead for college autonomy, I am not talking about a large number of such sub-standard colleges. These colleges do not have either competent staff or a reputed principal. In Gujarat, until some years ago, certain qualifications and rules were laid down for the posts of college lecturers and professors, but none such requirements existed for college principals. However curious it may sound, the fact was that no qualifications were laid down for the post of a college principal! And when the college principal is not competent and reputed, how can one expect such colleges to attract and retain competent staff and good students?

When I advocate college autonomy, I have in view colleges which have attained reasonably good standards. Now, it is rather paradoxical that universities which are fighting for their own autonomy are not prepared to recognise college autonomy. The Universities must recognise and respect—and not give—autonomy of the colleges. On the other hand, in order to preserve their autonomy, the colleges may well have to assert themselves. It is true that colleges are bound by certain University regulations. Nonetheless, wherever college authorities are given discretionary powers, their right to use them must be retained and respected.

I now propose to discuss briefly the role as well as problems of the various personnel connected with the colleges.

Principal:

The principal is the Centre of college administration. He is the keystone in the arch. The vitality of college campus depends upon him and his doings. That is why the principal should be selected with great care; and, once chosen and appointed he should be given as much freedom as possible so that the college autonomy is pre-

served and enhanced. It is absolutely essential that the principal is a teacher first and last, and he must actively engage himself in teaching at all levels. He should be an academician-cum-administrator. I suggest that this post of a principal should be held by senior professors by rotation, for a period of four to five years, so that no teacher gets stale or no one becomes outdated. Administration and routine work does involve curtailment of the time of a principal for reading and writing which are so essential for good teaching. This job of a principal involves a large amount of paper work. But a principal must always remember that behind such paper work are the live problems, anxieties and aspirations of boys and girls. In order to maintain decorum and discipline, he has to constantly listen to the students with sympathy and earnestness. He is expected to give them proper and fuller explanations of his decisions and regulations. A principal has to be an imaginative administrator for this purpose.

There is undoubtedly, a great need for integrity and independence on the part of a college principal. He has to act as a bridge between (a) Management and faculty, (b) management and University, (c) University, faculty and students, and (d) University, management and general public. He has to be, as it were, a unifying force, a cementing link between all of them.

Faculty :

The term 'staff' which has come from the description of military organisation is not very appropriate or happy for use in academic institutions. It suggests the idea of hierarchy which is not conducive to autonomy. The spirit of fellowship and fraternity among the faculty members is very necessary for college autonomy. This can be created by a spirit of understanding and not by law or command.

Moreover, the teachers should get decent salaries and adequate allowance; and, their conditions of service should be honourable, just and satisfactory. At present, management and administration in several colleges compel their teachers to follow a particular method of teaching and even force them to dictate notes to the students in the class rooms. This form of ugly compulsion must stop forthwith. Young and intelligent teachers, particularly, should be free to teach the way they like and without any hindrances. They should be free to recommend the books they like. There should be sufficient scope for the teachers to experiment with their subjects, students and scientific techniques of teaching, with a view to strengthening the academic life of the campus.

It is, of course, necessary to pay adequate salaries to the teachers; however, a true teacher values his freedom more than his salary and other emoluments. The teachers on their part must also realise that they are living in a dynamic society. In the modern world, knowledge is expanding very rapidly and therefore the rate of its obsolescence is very high too. Under the circumstances, the teachers, if they are to remain competent and upto date, will have to be very alert and active. Any failure on their part in this regard can only result into highly difficult and even obnoxious situations.

Governing Board :

The Governing Board will have an important role to play in preserving college autonomy. The nature and extent of college autonomy would depend largely upon the place given to the college principal in the Governing Board. The college principal must be a fullfledged member of this Board. Indeed, he should act as the Member-Secretary of the Governing Board. The University should put this as a condition for affiliation. In the interest of college autonomy, the University should insist on the

fulfilment of two other conditions viz., (1) the college principal must have a voting right in the Governing Board and (2) his presence should be considered and counted for constituting quorum for Governing Board meetings. To some, all this may appear somewhat utopian. I realise that in actual practice, the condition of a college principal to day is very pathetic. Therefore, it is all the more important that a concerted effort is made in this direction for preserving college autonomy. Moreover, the Governing Board should comprise of enlightened members who have a genuine interest in academic matters. This board must ensure that all academic decisions are taken academically. For example, when a college has insufficient finance, it offers only a few subjects. Instead, can it not spend proportionately less on grand buildings and more on good teaching and on a variety of subjects? Finance is, no doubt, an important consideration; however, it should not be brought forward every time as an excuse for not offering a good assortment of subjects to the students. Again, it is not for the principal to bring the money required for running a college. This is a job of management and the University, as also of the University Grants Commission and the State Government.

Students :

We tend to follow a policy of free and open and even haphazard admissions to arts colleges. It is observed that, generally, low calibre students and those with lower percentages are diverted to arts colleges. But, we expect these same colleges to provide us administrators, lawyers, judges, diplomats, journalists, professors etc! Therefore, the policy of admissions will have to be seriously reconsidered in the light of the role that we expect these arts colleges to play.

It is obvious that if University Education has to mean anything and be valuable, the students should be

able to choose from a wide variety of subjects. Such freedom and choice for students is very necessary. But, unfortunately, the present policy with the colleges seems to be to earn as much profit as possible by exploiting the students and denying them any such freedom and choice in the selection of subjects. It would not be proper for management to deny the students the freedom to choose from a variety of subjects merely on the ground of financial constraint. It should be possible for the colleges to use the surplus earned from some so called "popular subjects" for offsetting losses in other subjects. Some rationalisation is possible here if several colleges in a given area or city jointly adopt a judicious policy of offering specialisations.

As essential component of college autonomy will be that the students enjoy the following rights: (1) right to learn, (2) right to express their views freely and (3) right to be objectively evaluated at examinations.

Conclusion :

Among the various problems and challenges facing University education and administration in India to day, preservation and promotion of college autonomy is an important and even a crucial one. The brief outline that I have attempted to give above will, I hope, suggest a few lines along which further endeavours and improvement may be made for achieving some concrete and good results in this direction.

74-9076

17.8.79